



BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE GIFT OF

Julia Buddong

31 such the collection of
beginning materials has and
can be the same to
133 134 156 bag
163 such and to have
learned the terminology
but the term of matter
subject of the matter
171 a matter would be
a matter would be

217 Dear father & I say

to Peter

to Peter

122 page to be truly a man one
must have body soul & spirit
75 page idolatry to worship
the Father worship only
God man Christ
"ask me nothing but ask
the father in my name"

73 page human nature from Mary
suffered was tempted to evil of
various kinds all that Jesus
was the God within him had
it not been for the Mary son
would have been like other
Mary or Jesus sons.

129 uniting with God he says
we are as Father & Son
Bran

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF KING CHARLES THE FIRST
IN WHICH ARE CONTAINED
THE MOST IMPORTANT AND INTERESTING
PARTS OF HIS REIGN

BY JOHN HUME

IN TWO VOLUMES
THE FIRST VOLUME
CONTAINING THE HISTORY OF THE
REIGN OF KING CHARLES THE FIRST
FROM THE BEGINNING OF HIS REIGN
UNTIL HIS DEATH

IN TWO VOLUMES

LONDON
Printed by J. Sturges, at the
Printers Office, in Pall Mall
1764

B795.5
H586c2

LETTERS

TO

DR. PRIESTLEY:

CONTAINING PROOFS OF THE
SOLE, SUPREME, AND EXCLUSIVE DIVINITY
OF

Jesus Christ,

WHOM THE SCRIPTURES DECLARE TO BE

THE ONLY GOD OF HEAVEN AND EARTH;

Likewise of the Divine Mission of

EMANUEL SWEDENBORG:

BEING A

DEFENCE

OF

THE NEW CHURCH

Signified by the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse.

SECOND EDITION.

BY ROBERT HINDMARSH.

The Time cometh when I shall shew you plainly of the Father.

John xvi. 25.

London:

Printed and Published by T. GOYDER, 28, James Street,
Buckingham Gate, Westminster.

Sold also by H. C. Hodson, Cross Street, Hatton Garden; E. Baylis, Old Church
Yard, Manchester; D. G. Goyder, Meadow Street, Bristol, and
all other Booksellers.

1822.

Property of

CBSA

Please return to

Graduate Theological



BX

8721

H56

1822

LETTERS

TO

THE PRESBYTERY

OF THE

Church of Christ

AND THE SOCIETY OF THE

THE GREAT END OF HEAVEN AND EARTH

Addressed to the Divine Mission of

MINISTERIAL SWEDENBORG

BEING A

DEFENCE

OF

THE NEW CHURCH

as described by the New Testament in the Apocalypse

SECOND EDITION

By ROBERT SWEDENBORG

Printed by T. E. S. at the Press of the

London

Printed and Published by T. E. S. at the Press of the

the London Press, 17, Old Bailey

Printed and Published by T. E. S. at the Press of the

1822

795.5 Presented to UNITY SOCIETY,
586 SANTA ANA, CALIF.
By D. F. BURNHAM.

CONTENTS.

Page

LETTER I.

Of Miracles, and the divine Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg	1
---	---

LETTER II.

On the sole, supreme, and exclusive Divinity of Jesus Christ	49
--	----

LETTER III.

Miscellaneous.

I. Of the Connection between Religion and the Civil Power	136
II. Of the Human Form of God ..	141
III. Of the Union of Divinity and Humanity in the Person of Jesus Christ, and at the same Time of the Divine Omnipotence ..	155
IV. Of the Holy Scripture, and the Science of Correspondences	172
V. Of the Second Coming of the Lord	195
VI. Of the Last Judgment	199
VII. Of the Resurrection	207
VIII. Of Marriages in Heaven	216
IX. That Love and Wisdom are Substances, and not mere Properties	225
X. Of the Divine Influx	232
XI. Of the Discovery of the Georgium Sidus	236
XII. Of Time and Space in the Spiritual World	239
XIII. Of Charity; and how it is to be understood, that neither Arians nor Socinians can be admitted into Heaven, when yet Men of every religious Denomination may be saved, if they live uprightly and conscientiously according to the best of their knowledge	248

CONTENTS

183

LETTER I.

Of Music, and the divine mission of Handel
.....

LETTER II.

Of the religious and exclusive Trinity of Jesus
.....

LETTER III.

.....

188

I. Of the Connection between Religion and the Civil
.....

191

II. Of the Human Form of God

III. Of the Union of Divinity and Humanity in the
.....

Form of Jesus Christ, and of the same Form of
.....

195

the Divine Omnipotence

IV. Of the Holy Scriptures and the Science of Cal-
.....

197

.....

V. Of the Second Coming of the Lord

199

VI. Of the Last Judgment

201

VII. Of the Resurrection

203

VIII. Of Angels in Heaven

205

IX. That Love and Wisdom are Substantive, and not
.....

207

mere Properties

209

X. Of the Divine Image

211

XI. Of the Discovery of the Georgian Sides

213

XII. Of Time and Space in the Spiritual World

215

XIII. Of Charity; and how it is to be understood,
.....

that neither Angels nor Spirits can be admitted
.....

into Heaven, when yet Man of every religion is
.....

admission may be given, if they live uprightly
.....

and conscientiously according to the best of their
.....

217

.....

PREFACE.

ON the first appearance of Dr. Priestley's *Letters to the Members of the New Jerusalem Church*, I was requested by several persons to draw up an answer to him. This I declined for a considerable time, not doubting but some abler hand, with more leisure than myself, would undertake the task. But a meeting of the Society in London being called to take into consideration the expediency of a public reply, it was their unanimous request, that I would immediately take up the pen, and defend the doctrines of the New Jerusalem against the attack which had been so recently made upon them. Finding myself thus called upon, I no longer hesitated, but devoted the few leisure hours I had to spare, to the support of those great truths, which from many years close attention I have good reason to believe of heavenly extraction. How far I have succeeded in the attempt, must be left to the judgment of the candid and impartial reader, who, no doubt, is sufficiently aware, that on every possible occasion it is his duty to examine both sides of a question, before he ventures to decide in favour of either.

It is a common remark, that persons engaged in controversy too frequently treat each other with unbecoming asperity; imagining, no doubt, that their arguments will thereby gain a considerable accession of strength; or at least, that, as opponents, they have a right to indulge themselves in personal re-

flections, merely on account of their difference in opinion. But I hope nothing of this kind will appear in the following *Defence*. I have endeavoured, as much as possible, to avoid it. Yet should there be any thing in it that will admit of such a construction, I beg it may be considered as unintentional; for I can assure the reader, I have no view to offend any person; having, to the best of my knowledge, been influenced by no other motive in writing, than the love of truth, that it may be first discovered, and then practised.

As human creatures born in ignorance, and designed by the great Creator of the universe to pass through various stages of intelligence, from the obscurity of *sensual apprehension*, to the brightness of pure *intellectual truth*, we are all, while in this first or present state of existence, continually exposed to error and deception. So many are the false appearances of things without, and so many are the prejudices and passions within, which combine to obstruct our progress in mental perfection, that unless we tread the ground of inquiry with the utmost circumspection and caution, paying every attention that is due to the sentiments of others, as well as entertaining the most scrupulous distrust of our own hearts and understandings, instead of discovering what we all profess to be in search of, we shall only bewilder ourselves in the mazes of conjecture, and having the door of our mind shut against the light of truth, continue to grope in the dark.

The fallacies arising from the appearances of natural objects, when presented to the bodily senses, may easily be rectified, because of these the learned are sufficiently aware. But it is not so easy to detect the fallacies which arise from the appearance of intellectual objects, because few consider, that the

human mind is furnished with senses peculiar to itself, just as the body is ; and that for the most part, our first apprehensions of spiritual things are as imperfect and foreign to the real truth, as the first notions we entertain of natural things. The fact, however, is as here stated ; and therefore it behoves us, if we are in earnest to obtain the prize of wisdom, to be perpetually on our guard against the delusion of appearances, ever holding our minds open for the reception of further light, and more just information.

As most of the objections, which Dr. Priestley has urged against the doctrines of the New Church, are the same as are usually made by many other persons on their first reading the writings of Swedenborg, in consequence of not thoroughly understanding them ; I have been the more particular, on that account, in obviating *all his objections* ; so that the following *Defence of the New Church* may be considered not only as an answer to Dr. Priestley's *Letters*, but likewise to all other opponents who tread on similar ground. I have not shunned, in the smallest degree, an examination of any question, but have allowed to every argument of opposition its full weight and importance. Those passages of Scripture, which the doctor has urged as the most decisive proofs in favour of his own system, and against the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, are considered with all the attention and candor I am master of ; and such answers and explanations are given, as I hope will prove satisfactory to every unprejudiced reader, who is in search of truth purely for its own sake. Particularly I have taken pains to demonstrate, as the fundamental article of the true Christian religion, the sole, supreme, and exclusive divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ;

proving by the most undeniable authority of the general tenor of the Scriptures, that their grand design is, to reveal to mankind, not merely that there is a God, who created the universe and all its furniture, but that this God is in a Human Form, that out of pure love and mercy he himself came down from heaven into the world to redeem and save mankind, and that he is no other than the Divine Man JESUS CHRIST. And here I must say, if Jesus Christ be not the *true*, the *only* God, that the design of the Scriptures is yet unfulfilled, and that Christians to this day are as ignorant of, and unacquainted with, the supreme Governor of the universe, as the Athenians were, when Paul saw them pay their devotions *to the unknown God*; for to all who consider the Divine Being as superior to Jesus, or in any respect different from him, he is still a God unmanifested, invisible, unknown. But the great Jehovah hath manifested himself in the flesh, and thereby made himself visible and known to his creatures, not by any mere deputation, commission or message, through the medium of another, but by his own personal and actual incarnation. Thus he, who in ancient times was the object of patriarchal worship, as Jehovah the Father in a human form, became in later times the object of apostolic worship, as the Messiah, Son, Redeemer of the world; and lastly, in his New Church is now worshipped as Jehovah the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, inseparably united in one divine person.

The Scriptures throughout testify of Jesus, as he himself teaches in John v. 39; and this testimony is evidently the burden of all revelation. The historical, prophetical, and evangelical books are full of it, insomuch that it may with truth be said, they are *in labour* to bring forth their *only Son*, their *only*

Man, JESUS CHRIST; the acknowledgment of whom, both in doctrine and life, as the alone Creator and Saviour of the world, is that new birth in every individual, which they so strenuously inculcate, and which is so worthy of their divine contents. But on the supposition that Jesus is a *mere man*, according to the view of Socinians, I must candidly confess, that the perpetual reference to the Messiah in the Old Testament, and to Jesus in the New, which is so striking as to escape the notice of perhaps none, would appear to me to be little better than a burlesque on the fallen condition of the human race, if after all, the person, through whom they are to look for redemption and deliverance, is no greater, no abler, no wiser, no better than themselves. For if Jesus be a mere man, nay if he be any thing short of the supreme God himself, he must have been unworthy of that high and exalted character which we find uniformly ascribed to him by prophets and apostles; unworthy to be called by them the Saviour of the world, or to be considered by us as the single Hero of divine revelation.

This subject, however, with a variety of others closely connected with it, will be found treated more at large in the following sheets. I have here only to add, that the sole, supreme, and exclusive divinity of Jesus Christ will admit of a thousand times more abundant proof from the Scriptures, than could possibly be comprized within the limits of the present work: and although this *Defence of the New Church* considerably exceeds the bounds I at first proposed to myself, when I sat down to write an answer to Dr. Priestley, yet, when compared with the magnitude of the subjects I have undertaken to defend and explain, perhaps it scarcely amounts to the value of a mite thrown into the increasing trea-

sury of the New Church. . However, such as it is, I offer it to the world. What kind of reception it may meet with, or what effect it may produce in the mind of the reader, I do not pretend to anticipate : yet should it become the means, under divine providence, of conveying truth to the breast of a single individual, or of guarding one mind against the dangerous errors of Socinianism, I shall think myself happy in the reflection, that I have not spent my time in vain, but that as a member of society I have been in some small degree an instrument of use.

ROBERT HINDMARSH.

London, Jan. 7, 1792—36.

LETTERS, &c.

LETTER I.

Of Miracles, and the divine Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg.

IT is unnecessary, Sir, to make any apology for calling your attention to the following sheets, as I conceive myself in some measure entitled to that indulgence, in consequence of the *Letters* you have lately addressed to the *Members of the New Jerusalem*, among the number of whom I profess myself an humble individual. As it is my intention to obviate every objection you have brought against the credibility of Baron Swedenborg's testimony, as well as against the doctrines of the New Church, I shall take the liberty of making my observations in that order which appears to me most likely to clear the ground as we go. I therefore propose, in the present letter, to consider what is the most proper evidence of a man's inspiration and divine mission, and how far the pretensions of Baron Swedenborg are supported by such evidence as is at once both rational and satisfactory. In the course of this examination, I shall naturally be led to inquire into the true nature and tendency of miracles.

But here give me leave to make one observation, previous to my entering on the subject, which I wish both you and myself to bear in mind, and to consider as the condition of our correspondence. It is this, that during the present controversy (if such it must be called) no difference of sentiment, no opposition of argument, no strength of expression in favour of our respective opinions, shall by any means be deemed a breach of charity, or a personal reflection. With this condition in view, I now proceed with my subject.

In the first part of your Preface, you pay an handsome compliment to those members of the New Church, with whom you are acquainted; for which I am sure they have politeness enough to make you a suitable acknowledgment. I hope "the evident good sense, and good conduct," which you are pleased to say you discovered in them, will not be considered as any proof of their weakness and superstition, in having embraced a system of divinity, which has been proved by Baron Swedenborg to be the only true christian religion, although in page xii you pronounce it to be a mere "visionary scheme, and destitute of all rational evidence."

To prevent the imputation of unfair conduct in misrepresenting any of your assertions, and that every reader may judge of the propriety or impropriety of my answers; I think the most candid, as well as the most just mode of procedure will be, first to state your own words, and then to make my remarks.

In page xii of your Preface you observe as follows: "To many persons it will appear not a little extraordinary, that a scheme of religion so visionary, and so destitute of all rational evidence, as that of Baron Swedenborg, should be so firmly believed by such numbers of persons of unquestionable good sense, and the most upright intentions;

and some may be disposed to say, that *christianity itself might have had no better an origin*.—There is nothing, however, so improbable in itself, but what persons of a certain turn of mind may *not* be pre-disposed to believe. And they who already believe the inspiration of some persons, will easily admit that of others, who, in their idea, carry on the same scheme, or one similar to it. *Thus the miracles of the popish saints were received without much difficulty, after those of the apostles and primitive christians*.—Any person of reputable character, and not apparently insane, gravely and repeatedly asserting his inspiration, and his intercourse with God or angels, and advancing nothing contrary, or supposed to be contrary, to what other acknowledged prophets had advanced before him, will be believed by some; and the credit of these may in time be the means of procuring him credit with others. And thus it appears to me, that credit was acquired to the pretensions of Mahomet, and has been to those of Baron Swedenborg.”

In reply to the above, I shall take the liberty to offer a few reflections as they occur. In the first place then, if, as you acknowledge, “such numbers of persons of unquestionable good sense, and the most upright intentions,” do actually and firmly believe the testimony of Baron Swedenborg; this is certainly a strong presumption that they can see a *reasonableness* in his assertions, as well as a manifest *agreement with divine revelation* in all the doctrines of the New Church, which, by your own confession, you have neither eyes nor understanding to discern.

But, Sir, I do not know how to reconcile your mode of accounting for our embracing the doctrines of Baron Swedenborg, page xiii, with your polite assertions in page xii. You first say we are men of “*unquestionable good sense*,” and in the very next page pass us off as a set of the *weakest*

enthusiasts in the world, who are prepared to give credit to any idle tale, provided it be but gravely and repeatedly asserted. One would imagine, that no person possessed of good sense, or in other words, of a sound understanding and solid judgment, (as you allow some of the members of the New Church to be,) would suffer himself to be deluded either by the pre-disposition of his own mind, or the grave and repeated assertions of another, into such a visionary scheme as you suppose our's to be, unless he saw it had its basis in truth, and was capable of being supported by rational evidence, as well as by the acknowledged oracles of divine revelation. Still less is it to be supposed, that whole societies and communities of men would embrace the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, (and that too even in opposition to former prejudices instilled into them from infancy by education and example,) unless they perceived in them an internal evidence of their own truth, and felt the firmness of the ground on which they stand.

There seems to be something very singular in the observation you make, that “some may be disposed to say, that *christianity itself might have had no better an origin,*” than the system of religion which is now beginning to dawn upon the earth, under the name of the *New Church*, or *New Jerusalem*. You do not surely mean to insinuate your *doubts* concerning the truth of the christian religion, by saying so? Indeed, Sir, one would be almost ready to conclude as much, particularly as you add, “They who already believe the inspiration of some persons, will easily admit that of others, who, in their idea, carry on the *same scheme*, or one *similar to it*. Thus the miracles of the popish saints were received *without much difficulty, after those of the apostles and primitive christians.*” This certainly amounts (at least in my view) to the same thing, as if you had in plain terms said, ‘The miracles of

the popish saints would never have received any credit, unless men had been *weak enough* first to believe those of the apostles and primitive christians.' It also, I think, fairly implies, that as you yourself have too much sense to believe the popish miracles, so you do not acknowledge those of the apostles; for the one, you seem to say is a natural consequence of the other.—I do not wish to press you too hard on this point; I rather hope I may have misapprehended your meaning. But really, Sir, I could not help making these reflections in my own mind, while I was reading the above, and various other passages in your Letters.

As to the insinuation that the pretensions of Baron Swedenborg are no better than those of Mahomet, merely because he did not support them by miracles, if it proves any thing, it proves too much; for on this ground you will find yourself put to the necessity of denying the divine mission of many of the prophets, as well as of John the Baptist. What miracle, let me ask, did Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, or Haggai, with several others whom I could name, perform, in order to convince the people, that they were the true messengers of Jehovah? Not a single one that I know of. Will you therefore infer, that they were impostors, because they did not come with miracles in their hands? Had you lived in their day, you might with as good reason have objected to their *single* testimony of their own divine mission, as you now do to that of Baron Swedenborg. With equal propriety you might have said to Jonah, when he was proclaiming the destruction of Nineveh, 'Unless you will convince me by a miracle, that you are sent of God, I will not believe a word you say.' Had the Ninevites reasoned in this manner, in all probability they would not have lived to lament their folly.

Again, what miracle did John the Baptist do, to convince the Jews that he was *more than a prophet*, as being the immediate forerunner of our Lord? If, as you say, p. 8, “the *only proper evidence* of a divine commission is doing something that God alone could enable a man to do,” (meaning a miracle,) how happened it, that John, whose commission and character were more dignified, than those of any former prophets, did not display the necessary requisites for commanding the public attention? If to gain credit *simply as a prophet*, it is indispensably necessary to work a miracle, what may we not expect from him who comes to us as *more than a prophet*? John the Baptist however, performed no miracle as a proof of his mission, and yet he was pronounced by the Lord himself to be greater than Moses, or any of the prophets, notwithstanding all the miracles which they performed. In proof of these assertions, I shall just beg leave to transcribe the following passage from Matthew. Speaking of John the Baptist, Jesus says, “What went ye out for to see? a prophet? yea, I say unto you, and *more than a prophet*. Among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist,” Matt. xi. 9, 11. And in John x. 41, 42, it is said, “*John did no miracle; but all things that John spake of this man, (Jesus) were true. And many believed on him there.*” The truth is, rational evidence is *stronger* than any miracle, because it reaches the *understanding*, which no miracle ever did, or ever can do. I am therefore surprised, how any man, that calls himself a *lover* of truth, and a *searcher* after truth, can yet *turn his back* on truth, together with sound reason, the *proper evidence* of truth, and call out for a miracle!

Having seen that several of the prophets gave no proofs of their divine mission by working miracles, and that their testimony in many cases is admitted merely on their own

bare assertions; let us now inquire whether it has been the general custom of mankind to give implicit credit to those who had the power of working miracles; and after viewing the effects naturally produced by them on the human mind, together with their real uses and design, we shall be the better prepared to take into consideration the divine mission of Baron Swedenborg.

In page 8, you say, "When Moses was appointed by God to carry a message to his nation, and to the king of Egypt, he naturally said, *Exod. iv. 1, But behold they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say the Lord hath not appeared unto thee.* In answer to this, God bade him throw down the rod that was in his hand, when it was instantly changed into a serpent, and he was ordered to show the same sign to his countrymen, and to Pharaoh, *iv. 5, that they may believe that the Lord God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, hath appeared unto thee.* Accordingly he did exhibit this sign, and by this means satisfied them, that God had sent him."

It is true that the Lord enabled Moses to perform many miracles before his countrymen, in order to convince them that God had sent him. But that this conviction of their's was a mere *superficial impression* upon their outward senses, and carried with it nothing of *rational evidence* to their understandings, is plain from almost every part of their history. As soon as ever they had fairly escaped from the Egyptians, and were got into the wilderness, *the people absolutely murmured against Moses and Aaron* who had performed the miracles, and thereby brought them into a situation where they dreaded being destroyed by hunger and thirst. See *Exod. xv. 24. Chap. xvi. 2, 3.* They even accused Moses of a design and intention to kill them, and were on that account just on the point of stoning him

to death, Exod. xvi. 4. If the miracles, which Moses and Aaron performed, had really operated upon their minds a full and rational conviction that they were sent by God, how is it possible they could so soon forget them, notwithstanding their greatness and frequency? The truth is, they only believed (or rather, were *compelled* against their wills to acknowledge) the miracles for the moment, while they were present before their *senses*. How else are we to account for their successively and almost continually rebelling against Jehovah, in whose name all the miracles were performed?

It was from a principal of selfishness and fear only, that they followed Moses out of Egypt and through the wilderness; *selfishness*, because they expected at last to arrive in a land of plenty; and *fear*, lest they should be destroyed by that power, which had so wonderfully manifested itself in the miracles. But no sooner did this fear subside in consequence of their temporary cessation, than they returned to the natural hardness of their hearts, and fell into the grossest species of idolatry, namely, that of worshipping a molten calf, the work of their own hands; and what is singular, even Aaron, who had himself performed the miracles, joined with the people who were witnesses of them, in ascribing all the power to the calf, and saying, “*These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt,*” Exod. xxxii. 4. Nothing then can be produced as a more plain and undeniable fact, than that the miracles which were performed before the children of Israel, were considered by them as downright acts of *compulsive authority*; and that the conviction arising from them was a mere *superficial impression* upon their *outward senses*, and carried with it nothing of *rational evidence* to their *understandings*.

But if I understand you right, you say, page 9, that

Moses satisfied Pharaoh, as well as his countrymen, by the change of his rod into a serpent, that God had sent him. This, however, was not the case; for, *Exod. vii. 8 to 13*, “Jehovah said unto Moses and Aaron, When Pharaoh shall speak unto you, saying, *Shew a miracle for you*; then thou shalt say unto Aaron, Take the rod, and cast it before Pharaoh, and it shall become a serpent. And Moses and Aaron went in unto Pharaoh, and they did so as Jehovah had commanded. And Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and before his servants, and it became a serpent. But Jehovah hardened Pharaoh’s heart, that *he hearkened not unto them.*” Your assertion, therefore, that the sign which Moses exhibited before Pharaoh, “satisfied him that God had sent him,” is in direct opposition to the plain matter of fact. Pharaoh saw with unconcern the miracle of the rod being turned into a serpent; for “the magicians of Egypt did in like manner with their enchantments.” So that he could not tell by that sign alone, whether he was sent by *God*, or by the *devil*. Neither was he convinced of the divine mission of Moses and Aaron, by their smiting the waters, and turning them into blood; for “the magicians of Egypt did so with their enchantments.” So, after the plague of the frogs, which the magicians likewise produced, Pharaoh “hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them.” Nay, even on the dust of the earth being turned into lice, (which was a miracle that baffled the skill of the magicians, for “with all their enchantments they could not bring forth lice,”) still “Pharaoh’s heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them.” It was the same with the plague of flies, the murrain, the boils, the hail and fire, the locusts, and the thick darkness; for he would not let the Israelites go, till he was absolutely compelled to do so, by the slaying of the first-born: and last of all he pursued

them, till he, with all his host, was drowned in the Red Sea. Now as you have, in page 2, expressly renounced any faith in the *calvinistic* plan, you cannot with any propriety avail yourself of that system, by saying, that Pharaoh's unbelief was not chargeable on him, but on Jehovah, who had previously hardened his heart, on purpose that *he should not let the people go*, Deut. iv. 21.

By way of digression, I will here put a question to you. If you can answer it, well ; if not, then acknowledge fairly and openly, that there are mysteries in the holy word of the Lord, of which you are entirely ignorant, and which can only be understood by a knowledge of its spiritual sense. The question I have to propound is this, How and why was it, that the magicians, as well as Moses and Aaron, could turn their rods into serpents, and all the waters of Egypt into blood, and bring up frogs upon the land, *and yet could not, with all their incantments and mighty powers, produce lice ?* See Exodus, chap. vii. and viii. You cannot surely say, that it is a greater miracle to produce lice, than to bring forth frogs, and to turn rods into serpents, and rivers of water into blood ? Still less, I apprehend, will you venture to assert, as your most serious and deliberate judgment, that the production of lice is in itself a more rational and satisfactory proof of a *divine* mission, or more *worthy of the great Jehovah*, than the miraculous conversion of all the rivers, ponds, and pools of water in Egypt, into blood. According to the literal and obvious sense of the passage, however, by which you say you must in other cases be guided, it would appear that *such a miracle* is really greater, and more worthy of God. But how and why it is, remains for you to explain.

To return. You say, p. 9, "Our Saviour did not expect to be believed upon his own word, when he declared that God had sent him ; but said, John v. 36, 'The works

which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me ;' and we find that this was the circumstance that *convinced the Jews that he was a real prophet.*" Immediately after which you quote, as a proof of your assertion the words of Nicodemus to Jesus, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God ; for no man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him," John iii. 2. These passages, you seem to think, establish your position, That miracles are more effectual in procuring credit to the divine mission of a prophet, than any other means. In this, however, you are again most egregiously mistaken. The Jews in general were *not convinced* by any or all the miracles which Jesus performed, that he was a real prophet, much less that He was the true Messiah, or Son of God. Of this they are standing proofs against your hypothesis to the present day. It is not even true, that Nicodemus believed the testimony of Jesus, although you have brought his own words in support of your doctrine ; for in verse 11 of the same chapter our Lord in express terms tells him, "*Ye receive not our witness.*"

But why do you take upon you to say, that "our Saviour *did not expect* to be believed *upon his own word,*" but on account of his works only ? The evangelist John says, chap. iv. 41, that "*many believed because of his own word.*" And the Lord himself says, "He that heareth *my word* and *believeth* on him that sent me, hath everlasting life," John v. 24. "He that receiveth not *my words*, hath one that judgeth him," John xii. 48. Again, it is said, "*As he spake these words, many believed on him,*" John viii. 30. Was this *unexpected* by the Lord ? No truly ; "for Jesus *knew from the beginning* who they were that believed not," John vi. 64. And besides, "the words that he

spake, are "*spirit* and are *life*," verse 63. It is very clear, then, that the Lord called the attention of the people more to *his words*, than to *his works*; the reason of which was, because his words were calculated to inform, instruct, and convince the understanding, in a more effectual manner than the most miraculous of his works. When he found, they would not hearken to his words, he then referred them to his works: "*Though ye believe not me, (says he,) believe the works,*" John x. 38. "Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; *or else believe me for the very works' sake,*" John xiv. 11.

That the Jews in general did not acknowledge Jesus to be a real prophet, and sent of God, notwithstanding all the miracles he performed, is easily proved by the following passages in the gospels.

1. After Jesus had cast out the devils, and permitted them to enter into the herd of swine, "*the whole city* came out to meet Jesus, and when they saw him, they besought him that he would *depart out of their coasts,*" Matt. viii. 34. Mark v. 17. Luke viii. 37. If they had believed him to be a true prophet, it is probable they would rather have besought him to dwell amongst them, than to depart from them.

2. When Jesus healed the man with the withered hand, "*the pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him,*" Matt. xii. 14. Mark iii. 6. Luke vi. 11. Would they have done so, if that miracle had convinced them that he was a prophet, and sent of God?

3. Again, when Jesus healed a blind and dumb man, who was possessed of a devil, "*the pharisees said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils,*" Matt. xii. 24. Mark iii. 22. Luke xi. 15. Here

the pharisees were so far from acknowledging the *divine* mission of Jesus on account of this miraculous cure, that they even ascribed it to the power of the *devil* !

4. Again, when Jesus returned into his own country, and the people saw his “*mighty works*, they were *offended in him*. And he did not many mighty works there, *because of their unbelief*,” Matt. xiii. 37, 38, Mark vi. 3, 5. But according to your doctrine, Sir, their *unbelief* ought to have been the *very reason* why he should have done mighty works, if he wished to convince them that he was a prophet; for it is certainly unnecessary, and even absurd, to work a miracle in order to convince a man that *already believes*.

5. When Jesus healed the woman who had an infirmity eighteen years, “the ruler of the synagogue answered *with indignation*, because he had healed on the sabbath-day,” Luke xiii. 14. Thus we see, a superstitious prejudice in favour of the Jewish sabbath, so blinded the eyes of the chief ruler of the synagogue, that he could discern no traces of a divine hand in this extraordinary cure.

6. Although Jesus healed the high priest’s servant’s ear, in the presence of those who came to apprehend him, yet so far was this miracle from convincing them of his divine mission, that they immediately “*took him*, and *led him*, and *brought him into the high priest’s house*,” &c. Luke xxii. 54.

7. Jesus performed a miracle on the sabbath-day, by healing an impotent man; “and *therefore* did the Jews *persecute him*, and sought to *slay him*.” And when Jesus thereupon took occasion to inform them, that his miracles were performed by the Father and himself conjointly, the Jews sought *the more to kill him*, not only because he had broken the sabbath, but because he said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God,” John v. 16, 17, 18.

8. On Jesus raising Lazarus from the dead, many of the Jews who were present, and saw that extraordinary miracle, believed indeed on him; but some of them, it appears, did not; for they went their ways to the pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done. And the chief priests and the pharisees convened a council, to consult how they might *put him to death, for working so many miracles*. See John. xi. 45, 57. Nay, the chief priests were so hardened, and incensed, that they even sought to *put Lazarus also to death*, although he had just been so miraculously raised from the grave, John xii. 10.

9. Notwithstanding all the miracles which Jesus performed before the Jews, it is said in Luke xxiii. 1, 2, that “*the whole multitude of them arose, and led him unto Pilate, and began to accuse him.*” Pilate, however, remonstrated with them; and declaring that he found no fault in him, proposed to set him free. But “*they all say unto him, Let him be crucified,*” Matt. xxvii. 22. Luke informs us, “*they cried out all at once, saying, Away with this man, crucify him, crucify him,*” Luke xxiii. 18, 21.

10. Lastly, As a plain and positive proof, that the Jews in general did not believe on Jesus, nor acknowledge him as a real prophet, and divinely commissioned, it is expressly said, John xii. 37, “*But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him.*”

It is true, indeed, there are various passages to be found in the gospels, which inform us, that great multitudes followed and caressed him after they had seen his miracles: but it is very evident from our Lord’s own declaration concerning such persons, that they followed him, not so much from any conviction of his divine mission, wrought in their minds by the miracles which he performed, as from a principle of low and gross sensuality; for he says in plain terms, “*Verily verily I say unto you, Ye seek me,*

not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled,” John vi. 26.

Agreeably hereto, it is observed in John ii. 23, 24, that although “many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did,” yet “Jesus did not commit himself unto them, *because he knew all men;*” plainly implying that the faith which is founded merely on miracles, is not the true and genuine faith which the Lord wishes to establish, because it resides only in the external man, and enters not into the internal, so as to form the *rational Christian*.

Miracles then avail nothing towards a rational and permanent conviction of the truth. This is likewise particularly evident in the case of the poor cripple at Lystra, who was miraculously cured by Paul. “When the people saw what Paul had done, they lifted up their voices, saying, The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men;” and they immediately prepared to pay him divine honours. Acts xiv. 8 to 18. But in the very next verse we are informed, that “there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium, who persuaded the people, and *having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead.*”

Where is it asserted in the Word of God, that no man ever was or will be divinely commissioned, without having the power of working miracles committed to him, as an undeniable proof of his mission? If such a condition is nowhere established, why do you take upon you to urge it as indispensably necessary? Our Lord says, “There shall arise *false Christs, and false prophets, who shall shew great signs and wonders, inasmuch that (if possible) they shall deceive the very elect,*” Matt. xxiv. 24, Mark xiii. 22. If so, then signs and wonders, or miracles, are no certain

proofs of a divine mission ; which is further evident from the following passage in the Apocalypse, “ And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet; for they are the *spirits of devils, working miracles*, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty,” Apoc. xvi. 13, 14. Here the power of working miracles is plainly and expressly attributed to devils. Again, when the pharisees and saducees desired that he would shew them a sign from heaven, Jesus answered, “ A *wicked and adulterous generation* seeketh after a sign,” Matt. xvi. 4. From which it appears, that it is a mark of *wickedness* and *adultery* to require signs and miracles as the proper evidences of divine inspiration. Therefore he told them, they should have no sign, Mark viii. 12.

It would answer no valuable end, to adduce more passages from the Word on this point ; it having been already clearly proved, that miracles in former ages were of themselves insufficient to work either faith or conviction in the human breast ; that in many cases they rather proved the occasion of men’s hardening their hearts, by closing the interiors of their rational mind ; and that frequently they were not at all considered as any genuine evidences of a divine mission, because they were equally within the power of wicked men and sorcerers.

You may perhaps say, ‘ Then for what end and purpose were miracles performed ? ’ I answer, Among others, for these great purposes ; first, that the Word of God might be written : secondly, to compel the Israelites to act in obedience to the orders given them, in order to *represent* the state and progress of the spiritual church ; for they being merely external and sensual men, having their inte-

riors closed, could, without danger of prophanation, be formed by miracles into the *representative of a church*, but never into a *real church*. The third use of miracles was, to point out man's regeneration, which is the cure of his spiritual maladies, and a miracle of miracles, being effected solely by the omnipotence of the Lord's divine human person. It was for this grand purpose, that so many miracles were wrought among the Israelites, by means of Moses and the prophets; and that the Lord himself, during his abode in the world, performed so many miraculous cures upon the blind, the deaf, the dumb, the lame, and the sick. For as all disorders originate in the vices of the spirit, and are no less than representative thereof; so the cure of men's bodily infirmities denoted the removal of those spiritual evils to which they correspond, and from which, as from their proper fountain, they have ever been derived.

* * *

Having thus demonstrated, that signs and miracles are not the only proper evidences of a divine commission, because they are equally capable of being performed by means of magical enchantments; having also proved, that the witnesses to such miracles in general gave little or no credit to the workers of them, but were merely struck with astonishment and awe during the moment of performance, though some even made it the occasion of hardening their hearts, attributing all the power to the devil; and having likewise seen the nature, end, and use of miracles; I shall now inform you on what authority the members of the New Church receive the testimony of Baron Swedenborg, and acknowledge him as divinely inspired, notwithstanding the dispensation he announces has nothing miraculous to accompany it. In doing this, I shall take the liberty of making such further remarks on the subject of miracles, as the nature of your objections may appear to require.

In p. xv. of your Preface, you tell us a story of “a Quaker going about the country, and giving an account of a trance he was thrown into, in which he had a sight of heaven and hell :” and although you “do not remember much of the vision at present,” yet you say “it was entirely unlike any of the memorable relations of Baron Swedenborg :” after which you add, “Now here is vision against vision, or rather dream against dream, and which of these are we to believe ?”

Had you been kind enough to favour us with a specimen of what you do remember of the Quaker’s vision, we might possibly have been enabled to form some judgment about it : but in the way you have stated it, it is out of any person’s power to tell whether your inference be a just one or not, when you say, “Here is vision against vision ;” for you must admit it to be possible, that what appears *inconsistent* or *absurd* to you, may appear just the contrary to another. And I apprehend you are at present so little apprized of the infinite variety of appearances, which both the heavens and the hells are capable of presenting, that were two different accounts of either the one or the other, as related by Baron Swedenborg, or by any other person whose testimony might be depended on, to be laid before you in a detached state, in all probability you would not hesitate to pronounce them absolutely heterogeneous and contradictory : and yet for all this I say it is *possible*, that both accounts may in themselves be true, and in the view of some persons clearly reconcileable to the laws of the spiritual world, although to you and others they may appear opposed to the nature and fitness of things. However, as in your comparison of Baron Swedenborg with your old friend the Quaker, you have brought forward no specific point for consideration, except the credibility of his single testimony, which you think not sufficient without *concur-*

rent evidence, of the want of which you complain, I shall for the present confine myself more particularly to this objection.

Now, I say, in support of the memorable relations which Baron Swedenborg has given relative to his intercourse with the spiritual world, there is *a great deal of concurrent evidence*, and that too of the very best sort; which, if you are desirous of seeing it in preference to the evidence of truth resulting from rational arguments, I will now lay before you, not only for your own meditation, but because I believe it may prove useful to some others of my readers. The evidence I allude to is that of the holy Scriptures, which you, in common with the members of the New Church, profess to believe. And I am the more inclined to adduce that evidence on the present occasion, because I observe you have omitted to take any notice of it, although in p. 68 of the Appendix to your *Letters*, you have transcribed a part of the very same section, n. 851, of Baron Swedenborg's *True Christian Religion*, in which it is to be found, and of the weight and importance of which one would think you must have been sensible at the time.

“That such things (says he) do really appear in the heavens, as are described in the above memorable relations, is clearly evident from similar things being seen and described by John in the Apocalypse, and also by the prophets in the Word of the Old Testament. In the Apocalypse we read, that John saw the Son of Man in the midst of seven candlesticks; that he saw a tabernacle, a temple, an ark, and an altar in heaven; a book sealed with seven seals, the book opened, and in consequence thereof horses going forth; four animals about the throne; twelve thousand chosen out of each tribe; locusts ascend from the bottomless pit; a woman bringing forth a man-child, and flying into the wilderness by reason of the dragon; two beasts, one ascending

out of the sea, the other from the earth; an angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel; a glassy sea mixed with fire; seven angels having the seven plagues; vials poured out by them on the earth, on the sea, on the rivers, on the sun, on the throne of the beast, on Euphrates, and on the air; a woman sitting on a scarlet beast; a dragon cast out into a lake of fire and sulphur; a white horse; a great supper; a new heaven and new earth; the holy Jerusalem coming down from heaven, described as to its gates, its wall, and foundations; also a river of the water of life, and trees of life bearing fruit every month; with many things besides, which were all seen by John, whilst as to his spirit he was in the spiritual world and in heaven. Not to mention what things were seen by the apostles after the Lord's resurrection, as by Peter, Acts xi. and by Paul; and also by the prophets in the Old Testament; as by Ezekiel, that he saw four animals, which were cherubs, chap. i. and x, and a new temple, and a new earth, and an angel measuring them, chap. xl. to xlviii; that he was carried to Jerusalem and saw there abominations, and also to Chaldea, chap. viii. and xi; the case was the same with Zechariah, in that he saw a man riding amongst myrtle-trees, chap. i. 8; that he saw four horns, and afterwards a man with a measuring line in his hand, chap. iii; that he saw a flying roll and an ephah, v. 1, 6; that he saw four chariots and horses between two mountains, chap. vi. 1, &c. So again with Daniel, in that he saw four beasts ascending out of the sea, chap. vii. 1, &c.; that he saw the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, whose dominion shall not pass away, and whose kingdom shall not be destroyed, chap. vii. 13, 14; that he saw the fighting of the ram and the he-goat, chap. viii. 1, &c.; that he saw the angel Gabriel, and conversed with him, chap. ix; that the young man of Elisha

saw chariots and horses of fire about Elisha, and that he saw them when his eyes were opened, 2 Kings vi. 17. From these, and several other instances in the Word, it is evident, that the things which exist in the spiritual world have appeared to many, both before and since the coming of the Lord: what wonder then is it, that the same things should now also appear, at the commencement of the church, or when the New Jerusalem is coming down out of heaven?"

Such is the concurrent testimony of the holy Scriptures, relative to the appearances in another life. Now, as the memorable relations of Baron Swedenborg are precisely of the same sort, having a similar tendency, and admitting of a similar (I do not say, *equal* degree of) illustration, it would appear, that a plain and downright opposition to the one, strongly implicates a secret denial of the other. But, do not think, Sir, that I mean to bring a charge of this kind against you, or any other person. It may be, that, in consequence of being educated from infancy in the belief of whatever is recorded in the Scriptures, without any examination at all, many of us have never yet considered or ventured to call in question the evidence, which the prophets give of their own memorable relations. Much of what they said, you know, depended upon their own single testimony: yet their visions are universally admitted by the christian church to be true, whether they are comprehensible or not. What concurrent evidence is there, for example, to prove the visions of John the Divine, as related in the Apocalypse? You will perhaps say, that they accord with those of Daniel, Ezekiel, and the rest of the prophets; and that from this harmony, together with the high character and eminent piety of the writer, results the proof of their divinity. Admitted: then, upon the same principle, why may not the harmony, which is plainly to be discerned in Baron Swedenborg's memorable relations, with those of the an-

cient prophets and apostles, be likewise admitted as satisfactory proof and evidence of their reality? especially as you allow the Baron to have been a man of acknowledged piety, and unimpeached character?

Supposing a great number of travellers, whose veracity we had no just reason to suspect, should in succession arrive in this country, and each of them assure us, that such and such were the laws, customs, and manners of a distant nation hitherto unknown; if there were an evident agreement in all their accounts, though related at different times, a reasonable man could not refuse his assent to their united assertions, however singular or strange the customs and manners of that distant nation might at first sight appear. And if, after an interval of seventeen hundred years since the other travellers had arrived, another should come from the same country, and by authority of the reigning prince, bring the same kind of testimony as his predecessors had done before him; together with an explanation of those former accounts, which to many were before unintelligible, but which the last traveller, in consequence of his acquaintance and familiar intercourse with the inhabitants of that distant nation for upwards of twenty-seven years, was enabled most completely and satisfactorily to do; what man is there, possessed of a sound understanding, and acquainted with the rules of evidence, that would object to this traveller's testimony, merely because he had no fellow-travellers, as witnesses to attest the truth of his assertions? Yet, (excuse the liberty) you appear to me to be precisely in the situation of such an objector. The prophets and apostles are the travellers first mentioned; the distant country is the spiritual world;* the last traveller from that world is

* The spiritual world is here compared to a distant country, not because it is such in reality, for it is close to us; but because it is so little known in the present day, and generally supposed to be at a distance.

Baron Swedenborg, who by commission from the Lord our Saviour, comes after a lapse of seventeen hundred years since the time of the apostles, with a testimony concerning that world, and its inhabitants, similar to what they had before given; but in consequence of upwards of twenty-seven years' converse with angels and spirits, enriched with additional illustrations, and still further discoveries of the same.

If you reflect seriously on the above, I hope you will no longer have occasion to "wonder at the strength of faith of Baron Swedenborg's followers," but rather, with us, lament the infidelity of the times, when so many, who profess to believe the Scriptures, refuse their assent to the first and fundamental principles of the christian religion.

Another proof of the divine mission of Baron Swedenborg arises from the manifest good tendency of all his writings, in almost every page of which he inculcates the necessity of leading a life of holiness and virtue. The two essentials, on which depends the whole of the law and the prophets, viz. an acknowledgment of the unity of God, and the loving him above all things, and our neighbour as ourselves, are in like manner insisted upon by Baron Swedenborg as the sum and substance of all religion, and the only means whereby our future happiness can be secured. Now as every man, as well as every tree, is known by his fruits, it follows, that that system of doctrines, which ascribes all glory and honour to the Creator and Saviour of the world, and which teaches love to him, and charity to all mankind, must proceed from God; and consequently, the message itself being proved divine, the bearer thereof must be estimated according.

* * *

I now proceed to obviate some other objections you have stated against the testimony of Baron Swedenborg, and the

want of miracles to support his pretensions : but as I observe there are many passages in your *Letters*, that require rectification, I shall be as brief as possible with each.

Page 10, you say, “Do we not object to the divine mission of Mahomet, that he worked no miracles?” Sir, if you have nothing more to object against the Mahometan religion than this, it appears to me, a Turkish magician might very easily convert you into a good Mussulman, by shewing you a few of his enchantments. Do you really suppose, that *no miracle can possibly be wrought, except in favour of the true religion?* If you do, (which indeed you acknowledge in the same page,) then your reason and judgment are no guard either against the miracles of magicians, or the lying wonders of false Christs ; but you are liable to become a prey to every delusion. A member of the New Church, Sir, has other objections to Mahometanism, than that of miracles ; and those objections are of an intellectual, rational kind, and not arising from the grossness of the bodily senses. But though the religion of Mahomet is far inferior to that of Jesus Christ, yet it was permitted by the Lord’s divine providence to be established among the eastern nations, as being the only one they were capable of embracing. And it is remarkable, that they acknowledge one supreme God, and Jesus Christ as his Son, whom they call the wisest of men, and the grand prophet, that came into the world in order to instruct mankind. A considerable part of the Mahometans allow Jesus Christ to be greater than Mahomet : and, if I am not mistaken, there is a particular sect among them, branded with the name of heretics, who acknowledge him as the true God.

Again, you observe, p. 10, “In the Old Testament we read of numbers of prophets from Moses to Malachi, *most of whom* either worked what we usually call miracles, or

foretold future events, which is exactly of the same nature, being equally within the province of *God alone*." Here you virtually acknowledge, that at least *some* of the prophets neither worked miracles, nor foretold future events. But in p. 11 you say, that "to come from God with a message to man, is a very serious and important thing, for which *no man, however excellent*, hath any right to expect that his own word only should be taken." May it not then be hence fairly inferred, that, to be consistent with yourself, you must reject the testimony of all those prophets who gave no supernatural proofs of their divine mission? Whether you really do reject their prophecies on that account, or not, I cannot take upon myself to declare; but you have certainly given the world just reason to suspect your belief in the Scriptures, together with the whole system of the Christian religion.

You further remark in p. 61, "This great Being (God, of whose essence you say you know nothing at all,) has, at different times, commissioned various men, and especially Jesus Christ, to communicate his will to mankind; and he *always* sanctioned their missions by the power of working miracles, or doing such things, as no man could have done, if God had not been with him." Several of the prophets, we have seen, made no appeal to the test of miracles; and as for the circumstance of some of them foretelling future events, this could carry no weight or authority with it, until the accomplishment of their prediction. It is plain, therefore, that some prophets, at the moment of their announcing themselves to be the messengers of Jehovah, made no such miraculous display of supernatural powers, as you assert to have been invariably the case; and yet the same persons were accepted as prophets by the Jewish nation, and are still accounted such by Christians.

In the preceding part of this letter it was proved, that

miracles may be, and have been, wrought by the power of the devil, or what amounts to the same thing, by magical incantments. Your assertion, therefore, that the performance of miracles is within the power of *God alone*, falls to the ground, and cannot be maintained except in opposition to the facts already stated.

You quote Deut. xviii. to prove, that the true prophets were to be distinguished from the pretended ones, by their foretelling things to come. They were so ; and in verse 22 of that chapter it is said, “ When a prophet speaketh in the name of Jehovah, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously ; thou shalt not be afraid of him.” Now the prophet Jonah, by the command of Jehovah, went through the streets of Nineveh, and without any conditions proclaimed its overthrow within forty days. Yet such an event *did not come to pass* ; for God repented of the evil that he had said he would do unto them, and he did it not ; at which clemency of the Lord, Jonah his prophet was highly offended. How you, who confine your ideas to the *mere letter* of Scripture, reconcile these, and many other passages, in all appearance more contradictory still, I know not. In my view, they are reconcileable only by means of the spiritual sense, which is in every part of the Word, the real existence of which you nevertheless deny.

* * *

Complaining of the want of miracles in support of the doctrines of the New Church, you make the following remark in p. 11, “ To say, that though the former dispensations of religion required to be established by miracles, this new one, the most magnificent of them all, and which is to continue for ever, requires none, is no better than saying, that though a cottage may require to stand upon a

rock, a palace, or a temple, like that of Solomon, may be built upon the sand, or stand without any foundation at all." On this subject I reason in quite a different manner from you, and say, As former dispensations required the aid and assistance of miracles in order to induce mankind to acknowledge them, this argues at least, that they did not carry with them that clear and rational evidence of their truth, which was of itself sufficient to gain credit among men: for wherever the truth of a thing cannot be established by any other means than by miracles, it plainly implies, that it is involved in obscurity, doubt, and uncertainty. Such was the case with all former dispensations, which only *shadowed forth* and *represented* the last and most magnificent of all, the *New Jerusalem*. This last and greatest of dispensations requires no miracle, because the truths it displays are of themselves clear, rational, and satisfactory. It is too dignified to stoop down to the earth for any thing that resembles a miracle; for by so doing, its heaven-born glory would be tarnished, and a cloud would overspread the sky, so as to interrupt the beams of celestial light proceeding from him who is the sun of righteousness.

He that requires a miracle to convince him of truth, in preference to rational investigation, assisted by light from the holy Word, may be compared to a man, who takes a tinder-box out of his pocket, and in mid-day with flint and steel strikes a light, to enable him to see whether the sun is shining or not. The flint and steel are his natural science; the match with brimstone at the end of it is self-love and self-derived intelligence; the tinder-box is the natural mind, where all scientific knowledge is treasured up; and his dark pocket is himself.

In the darkness of midnight a lighted torch, whose virtues are derived from the earth, may be useful where there is no other luminous body to emit light; it may even

represent, during the darkness of the night, the sun itself. Yet when the moon arises, which is only another, though more perfect *representative* of the sun, the light of the torch is lost. But when the sun itself is risen, and shines with the full splendour of the day, both the torch and moon, together with the stars, are no more thought of, their light being completely swallowed up by the superior brightness of the sun. Just so, in the midnight of the church universal, *miracles*, which do not go beyond the earthly or sensual principle, were granted to mankind, as a *torch* to lighten their footsteps, in the absence of heavenly truth. This was the time when the Israelitish and Jewish nation were led out of Egypt into the wilderness. Soon after, the *moon* arose, and some *stars*, as a still further light to their benighted posterity. I allude to the time when they were in possession of the land of Canaan, and were governed by *judges, kings, and prophets*. Last of all the *Sun himself*, the true light that enlightens every man coming into the world, rose upon the face of the earth; but before he arrived at the meridian, a thick cloud obscured him from the sight, and soon after he went down. This was the birth and crucifixion of our blessed Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*, by whom the primitive Christian church was founded, and preserved in its purity until the third century, when the dangerous errors of Arius and his adherents began to prevail. But now he comes a second time with all that fulness of meridian splendour, which is capable of dispersing the thick clouds of darkness from every mind that is in love with truth *for its own sake*, and who is desirous of receiving illumination, *not from earthly torches, but from heavenly light*.

Our Lord says, "He that believeth on me, the works that I do, shall he do also, and *greater works* than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father," John xiv. 12.

It may be supposed, that the Lord here alluded to the miracles which he would enable his disciples to perform after his departure out of the world, in order to give effect to their ministerial labours: but as there can be no greater miracle, literally speaking, than the raising of the dead, which the Lord himself more than once performed; it is plain, that the works here spoken of, as *greater than miracles*, must be of a spiritual kind; in which case the above passage will bear the following interpretation. He that believeth on the Lord, that is, in heart and life acknowledgeth him as one with the Father, and the only God of heaven and earth, shall, by virtue of his continual assistance, not only remove from himself, but also be the means of removing from others, all those evils and falses which infest the human mind, and which to subdue requires more of a divine agency, than the performance of any visible miracle whatever. To convert a sinner from the evil of his ways, and instead of the unclean delights of self-love and the love of the world, to infuse the pure and chaste delights of heaven, such as the love of the Lord, and neighbourly love, is certainly a much greater work than healing the lame, the blind, and deaf, or even raising a thousand dead bodies. But as this miraculous work of regeneration could not be effected, unless the Lord had glorified his humanity, which is meant by his going to his Father; and as the Holy Spirit was promised to the church after his glorification, by which is understood the more effectual operation of divinity when united to humanity, therefore the Lord says of the true believer, “Greater works than these shall he do, *because I go unto my Father.*”

I will just add here what a late ingenious writer, a *philosopher of the north*, says, in answer to those who bring against Baron Swedenborg such an objection as the following: “But he did no miracles!”—“The miracle of all

miracles (says he) is *truth*. That is the essence of them all. When God did miracles in former ages, it was not to *prove* truth : for, *one and one is three*, cannot be true by a thousand miracles ; nor, *one and one is two*, less clear without any. God, then, did miracles—only to strike with awe the hard hearts of mortals, and *awake their attention*. This was not necessary in an age of science and reasoning as now, when God has prepared all for the full perception of truth. From this observation you may see, *that miracles are only for fools*, for men still brutes, still savage. For when all the miracles are passed, there still remains the same great duty—to see and perceive the truth in your mind, without which neither faith nor worship exist.”

Upon the whole, then, we may safely conclude, that the ushering in and establishment of a new dispensation of divine truth, like that of the New Jerusalem, which requires not the aid of miracles or other *extraneous* evidence to support it, but depends solely on its own *intrinsic merit* for recommendation, from its manifest conformity to the true sense of holy Scripture, and the principles of sound reason, is an undeniable proof of its superiority over every other system of religion in the known world.

* * *

In page 11 you hint, that Baron Swedenborg’s communications with the spiritual world were no more than the effect of a warm imagination ; and seem to insinuate, that “his intercourse with God and the invisible world was by night. In this case (you say) such a person *seeing an angel in a dream*, is nothing more than his *dreaming he saw an angel*.” Now had you carefully examined Baron Swedenborg’s writings, you would have found, that his intercourse with the spiritual world was when he was *broad awake*, and not during his sleep, which was like that of

other men. In this particular, therefore, you have not done him justice. But if, as you say, a person's *seeing an angel in a dream*, is nothing more than his *dreaming he saw an angel*, what do you make of the dreams of the prophets? In what light do you consider those parts of the Scripture, where it is said, that the angel of the Lord appeared to men *in dreams*, and foretold future events *in dreams*? When the angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, and warned him against Herod, Matt. ii. 12, 13, was this nothing more than *dreaming he saw an angel*? And when it is said, Jehovah himself appeared to Solomon *in a dream by night*, 1 Kings iii. 5, does this imply nothing more, than that Solomon *dreamed he saw Jehovah*? Witticisms may do very well in some cases; but I hope you do not mean to apply them to subjects of a divine nature. I cannot help thinking, however, but many, on reading this part of your *Letters*, will be ready to conclude in their own minds, that you disbelieve and even despise the prophetic dreams, which are recorded in the Scriptures.

* * *

You well observe, p. 12, that Swedenborg was aware of the objection which you and others might make to his testimony, namely, that he wrought no miracles in confirmation of it. But I am rather surprized, that you treat his answer so lightly, particularly that part where he says, that miracles carry compulsion with them, and take away a man's free-will in spiritual matters. "The same objection (you say) might have been made to the miracles of Moses and of Christ. It is the nature of all evidence to compel the assent. For no man can refuse his assent to what *appears to him* to be sufficient evidence. Whatever be the case of the *will* with respect to motives, the *judgment* is universally allowed to be *necessarily determined* by the force of arguments." If it is the nature of all evi-

dence, to compel the assent, why did not the evidence which our Lord gave to the Jews, concerning himself, compel them to assent to his being the Son of God, and the true Messiah? Nay, why are *you* not compelled, by the miracles which Jesus performed, to believe him to be *one with the Father*, that is, *very God*? And why do you not find yourself compelled to assent to the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, by the rational and Scriptural evidence which Baron Swedenborg has given? Sir, herein lies the excellence of rational evidence, that *it never compels the human mind*; but as it is itself free, so it cannot impart any thing contrary to liberty. It must be in a state of freedom that it gains admission to the understanding; and it will never make that man a slave, who has opened his house for its reception. On the contrary, miracles, if they do not find men slaves, will soon make them such.

To say, that “no man can refuse his assent to what *appears to him* to be sufficient evidence,” is quite beside the question, and a mere play of words. You think there is a power in arguments capable of *necessarily determining the judgment*, independent of the *will*; but herein you only discover what little attention you must have paid to the human mind, and how imperfect your knowledge is of the secret workings of man’s heart. The Lord says, “If any man will *do his will*, he shall *know of the doctrine*, whether it be of God,” John vii. 17. that is, if any man’s *will* is inclined to good, then his *understanding* is fit for the reception of spiritual truth, and not before. Without this previous requisite, all the arguments in the world will have no weight with some minds. This is a truth so universally admitted, that it is even become a proverb to say, “There are none so *blind* as they that *will not see*.” Also, “What a man first *wishes or wills* to be true, he can soon *make himself believe* true.” On this very principle it is, that the civil laws of every country will allow no man to be a

competent *judge* in any case, wherein he himself is interested by *passion* or *affection*; it being one of the first dictates of wisdom, founded on the uniform experience of ages, that the *will* of man is capable of exercising such a malignant influence over the *judgment* or *understanding*, as even to deprive it of the faculty of perceiving and acknowledging genuine truth.

But something further seems to be implied in your assertion, that “the judgment is necessarily determined by the force of arguments;” namely, that all who have read your *Letters*, or other writings, are convinced of their truth, and consequently agree with you at least in judgment; for I dare say you think you have used weighty and powerful arguments to support your various hypotheses. But in this matter I believe you are much mistaken; and so shall I be too, if your *Letters* convince a *single member* of the New Church, either that Jesus Christ is not the supreme God, or that Baron Swedenborg was not inspired by him.

* * *

After quoting some excellent and highly rational remarks of the Baron on the subject of miracles, in which he particularly shews the reason why they were wrought previous to the Lord’s coming into the world, and are not now, viz. because men were then merely natural men, incapable of seeing the spiritual or internal things of the church, whereas now they have a capacity of discerning them; you object as follows: “That any change was made in the nature of men at the first coming of Christ, or that any further change has been made in man since what you call his second coming, is an arbitrary supposition of Swedenborg’s, for which he produces no evidence whatever.” In answer to this I shall observe, that when any change takes place in so large a community of men as that of the Christian world in general, it is not easily to be discovered from

any *particular acts* of particular individuals, or particular societies ; but may be seen by a comprehensive mind, that is capable of collecting into one view the apparently detached operations of a thousand contemporary and successive societies. This is the way to judge of that spiritual light and liberty, which has lately made its appearance in the world. The *precise moment* when it began, may be as difficult to determine, as it would be for you to point out the *first day* in which Frenchmen began to think of civil liberty. That some change or other has actually taken place among the nations of Europe, with respect to what are called the *natural rights of man*, you yourself are one of the first to publish. This you can see and acknowledge, because it is made manifest to the *outward senses*. But being unwilling to elevate your mind above the sphere of external objects, you do not perceive, that there is an equal degree of spiritual liberty, operating *within* that which is natural, and even producing it as its offspring ; which latter, however, too often degenerates into licentiousness ; and then, so far from deserving the name of liberty, it breaks the bonds of society, and while it pretends to support the sacred rights of man, actually tramples them under its profane foot.

The great change that took place at the time of the Lord's first coming, consisted not so much in the adoption of any new external forms of worship, as in a new capacity men received for understanding the interior things of heaven and the church. Every thing before was typical or representative : but when he came, of whom all the Scriptures testify, and to whom they all referred, then the whole cloud of shadows and representations that veiled the light of the sun, disappeared, and the minds of men received new illumination ; as it is written, "The people that walked in darkness, have seen a great light ; they that dwell in the

land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined," Isaiah ix. 2.

A similar change has taken place in the minds of men since the year 1757, the period when (according to Baron Swedenborg) spiritual liberty was restored by the accomplishment of the last judgment in the spiritual world. And it may even be seen in the evident decline of ecclesiastical power, particularly in Roman Catholic countries. It may be seen in the general spirit of free inquiry that begins to pervade the world; in the expulsion of Jesuits from different kingdoms; in the comparatively timid and cautious proceedings of the inquisition, in those countries where it is not yet abolished; in the suppression of monasteries; in the pope's silent and humble resignation of those more than regal powers, which his predecessors had usurped and impiously exercised over kings and princes; in the benevolent exertions of the friends of humanity for the abolition of slavery; in the new and successful institutions for the gradual instruction and reformation of the poor; in the improved regulations of prisons, and numerous other instances of national police; in the humane societies formed for the recovery of persons apparently dead; and, lastly, it may be seen plainly and decidedly in the actual commencement of the New Church, called the New Jerusalem, whose members require no miracles to convince them of truth, being in possession of what is a thousand times more excellent and satisfactory, namely, the true interpretation of the Scriptures, supported by clear and rational evidence. A community of this kind, rising up in the present day, and spreading itself over the face of the whole earth, is the most undeniable proof of Baron Swedenborg's assertions concerning the new light and liberty that has risen on mankind; for being a matter of fact, it bears down, by its own weight, ten thousand arguments of opposition.

* * *

Speaking further of miracles, you say, p. 14, “ If other methods fail to produce a general conviction of the truth of your doctrine, which you say is to fill the whole earth, recourse must be had to the old, but effectual method of miracles after all; and should each of your temples be filled with the *glory of the Lord* at the time of their consecration, as was the tabernacle and temple of Solomon, you would, I dare say, exult not a little. As a similar glory invested our Saviour at his transfiguration, all the three great dispensations of religion, you might then say, were distinguished by a similar divine attestation.” We do not say, that our doctrine is to fill the whole earth, so as to become the professed religion of all nations, to the exclusion of every other; for we consider the real visible church of Christ to be like the heart and lungs to the Grand Man of the world, the church universal being viewed by the Lord as *One Man*, or rather as *One Woman*, Apoc. xxi. 2. It is not in any wise necessary, that the heart and lungs should actually or literally fill the whole body; it is sufficient if life is conveyed from them to every part of it. So likewise in respect to the New Church; there is no necessity for its literally filling the whole earth, while life is communicated therefrom, like blood from the heart, to every nation and people of the world. But of this kind of reasoning I know you will require a miracle to be convinced, for I perceive nothing else will go down. As it is not, however, in my power to satisfy you in this particular, I must beg your indulgence while I deliver the sentiments of the New Church in her own language, even though the half of my remarks should be thrown away upon you.

Should our temples be filled with the glory of the Lord, like the tabernacle and temple of Solomon, we should, you think, exult not a little, and consider it as a divine attesta-

tion of the truth of our religion. Sir, our temples *are filled with the glory of the Lord*; for as at his transfiguration before Peter, James, and John, “*his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light,*” Matt. xvii. 2, so in his New Church he is worshipped and adored, in his Divine (transfigured) Humanity, as the glorious Sun of Righteousness, the source and fountain of life and light, and the one only and supreme God of heaven and earth. When we hear his holy Word read, we hear himself speak in his own divine language; and when, “beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounds (by his ministers) *in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself,*” we fall down in silent adoration at his feet, and having our “understandings opened to understand the Scriptures,” we perceive, by the glory that visibly surrounds him, that in his glorified person “all things are fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning him,” Luke xxiv. 27, 44, 45. Thus all former dispensations of divine truth have their central point and full accomplishment in this last and most magnificent of all; their glory and honour is brought into the holy city, New Jerusalem; and the Lord God Almighty, even the Lamb, Jesus Christ, is himself both the light and the temple of it. Apoc. xxi. 21, 22.

* * *

Your next observation, p. 15, is concerning Swedenborg’s assertion, that in the centre of Africa a revelation, similar to the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, is begun among the inhabitants of that country; and you seem to think, that we consider this circumstance “as a *proof*, that he was really inspired.” But in this point you are again mistaken; for we cannot consider any thing as a *proof*, before the truth of it be fully ascertained. Neither does Baron Swedenborg himself relate the narrative with

any view to establish his divine commission by such a kind of evidence. He simply declares the fact to be so, and leaves those who chuse to make inquiry into the truth of it. We embrace the doctrines he has published upon *quite another ground*, namely, because *we see with our own eyes or understandings*, that they are the doctrines of eternal truth, founded on the Word of God, and demonstrated by the acknowledged principles of right reason. We also, in cases where we have no other means of judging for ourselves, and in points that are not essential to salvation, receive his testimony on the credit of his own word; because we believe, both from his writings, and his personal good character, that he was incapable of any fraud or deception. And in thus giving credit to Baron Swedenborg for what he solemnly declares he was an eye and ear witness of, we conceive we do no more than you yourself do, and every other person who admits the truth of *historical facts* upon the single evidence of one writer or traveller.

But in p. 16 you observe, “that neither Mr. Bruce’s late travels into Abyssinia, nor the proceedings of the association for promoting the discovery of the interior parts of Africa, give us as yet any reason to think, that what Swedenborg describes as existing in his time, is to be found at present. But we expect soon to have further accounts from that hitherto unexplored part of the world; and if it should appear, which I strongly suspect, that there neither is, nor ever was any thing like a *New Jerusalem Church* in the centre of Africa, your faith in Swedenborg’s inspiration must be very strong indeed, if it be not well shaken.”

Abyssinia, you will be pleased to observe, is not the country in which Swedenborg asserts that the new revelation has commenced. It ought not therefore to be expected, that Mr. Bruce, who penetrated no farther than Abyssinia, should give the requisite information. Yet

even the travels of that gentleman furnish us with strong presumptive evidence, that the inhabitants of Africa have a much better knowledge of the existence of the spiritual world, and a life after death, than many of those who fancy themselves to be in the full enjoyment of the light of Christianity. But as neither the travels of Mr. Bruce, nor the proceedings of the African association, give the least proof of there being *no such a people* in the interior parts of Africa, as Baron Swedenborg describes, it is certainly too soon to conclude about the fact. From a *negative*, to infer a *positive*, is no sign of wisdom ; it is beginning at the wrong end, and out of *nothing* attempting to produce *something*.

As to the particular name of *New Church*, or *New Jerusalem*, I do not know that we are to expect ever to find a set of people expressly so called in the centre of Africa ; but if it should at any time hereafter appear, that there is actually a race of men in that part alluded to by Baron Swedenborg, who worship one God in a Human Form, and who have any knowledge of his having been born a Man on this earth, and at the same time live in mutual love and peace, we may then safely conclude, that they are the people among whom the revelation has taken place, whether they be distinguished as the *New Jerusalem*, or by any other name. But until this matter is fully ascertained, it will not admit of an argument on either side ; though even when fully established, I would not by any means wish the Baron's assertions to be considered of a miraculous nature, but simply as evidences that he had converse with angels and spirits. It is just in this point of view that he himself desired his friends to regard the many extraordinary particulars that transpired during his lifetime, and which proved him to be possessed of supernatural knowledge. Some of these are already related in his

theological works ; but there are others, the truth of which has been attested by persons of undoubted character. I shall take the liberty of mentioning a few of them in this place.

1. Count Hopken, a Swedish nobleman, has confirmed the truth of the two following transactions. After the decease of the Count De Marteville, certain persons came to demand a debt of his widow, of a considerable sum of money, that they said was due to them by her deceased husband. This she knew was not a just one, because it had been paid during his life-time ; yet could not tell where the acquittance or receipt was put. In her trouble she applied to Swedenborg ; and understanding that he had the privilege of conversing with the deceased, requested that (if possible) he would ask her late husband where the acquittance was. On the next day Swedenborg informed her, that he had seen and spoken to her deceased husband, who told him where he had put the acquittance, and that she would find it in the particular place he described. It was accordingly found in the same place ; and this account was universally known to be true both at Court, and in Stockholm. The Queen of Sweden herself, being afterwards on a visit at Berlin, confirmed the truth of this relation to several Academicians, whom she had invited to her table.

2. The second remarkable transaction is the following. The queen dowager of Adolphus Frederick, and sister to the late king of Prussia, soon after having heard of the foregoing account, and several others concerning the Baron, told the Senator Count Hopken, that she wished to speak to him. The Count, in going to carry the queen's orders, met Swedenborg, who was on his way to the palace, with a design to speak to that princess. After having conversed on various subjects, the queen informed him, that she had lately written a letter to her brother, a prince of Prussia,

who had since died. The contents of her letter, she observed, were of so secret a nature, that no person in the world had any knowledge of them, but that brother; and she wished Swedenborg to ask him, whether he had received her letter before his death: to which he replied, that he would give her an answer in a few days. At the time appointed Swedenborg waited on the queen, and related to her the whole contents of the said letter, word for word, at which she was struck with the greatest astonishment. He further informed her majesty, that her brother had received her letter, and begun an answer to it, and that in the escrutoire of the prince, was an unfinished letter, which he intended to have sent her before his decease. On this she sent to the king of Prussia, and the letter was found as Swedenborg had directed, which the king sent to her. This circumstance was also publicly known at Stockholm, and much talked of out of the kingdom. The Baron, in a letter to the Landgrave of Hesse Damstadt, dated July 13, 1771, confirms the truth of this relation, yet says, “It is not to be accounted as any kind of miracle, but only as a memorable transaction, like those found in the work entitled, *True Christian Religion*, concerning Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and others; which are only to be considered as evidences, that as to the spirit I have been introduced by the Lord into the spiritual world, and that I converse both with angels and spirits.”

3. A third memorable occurrence. On arriving at Gottenburg from London, Swedenborg was told that his house had been destroyed by the flames, in the great fire that burnt almost all the south suburb of Stockholm, in 1759. “No,” answered Swedenborg, “my house is not burnt, the fire only reached to such and such a part.” What he said was true; and the thing was of so recent a nature, that he could have had no particular account of it,

either by letter or any person; for it was about three days before the arrival of the post.

4. Mr. Springer, a Swedish gentleman, whose residence for many years was in London, in a letter to the Abbé Pernetty, librarian to the late king of Prussia, dated Jan. 18, 1782, relates the following particulars. “Fifteen years ago, Swedenborg was about to depart for Sweden, and desired me to procure him a good captain, which I did. I made the agreement with a person named Dixon; and Swedenborg’s effects were carried on board the vessel. When the captain came for Swedenborg, I took my leave of him, and wished him a happy voyage. Having then asked the captain, if he was provided with good and necessary provisions, he answered me, that he had as much as was needful for the voyage. On this Swedenborg said, “My friend, we have not need of a great quantity; for this day week we shall, by the aid of God, enter into the port of Stockholm, at two o’clock.” On captain Dixon’s return, he related to me, that this happened exactly as Swedenborg had foretold.”

Mr. Springer continues his letter in these words: “The whole of what he has related to me, concerning my deceased friends and enemies, and of the secrets which existed only between them and me, is almost past belief. He even explained to me in what manner the peace was concluded between Sweden and the king of Prussia, and praised my conduct on that occasion. He pointed out to me the three great personages, whose services I made use of in that circumstance, which was nevertheless a great secret betwixt us. I asked him how he could be instructed of these particulars, and who had discovered them to him? To which he replied, “Who informed me of your affair with Count de C—— E——d? You cannot deny the truth of what I have just related to you. Continue,” added he,

“to merit his reproaches ; depart not from the good way, either for honours or money ; but contrariwise, continue as constant therein, as you have been hitherto, and you will prosper.”

5. By the affidavit of Richard and Elizabeth Shear-smith, at whose house Baron Swedenborg lived and died, it appears, that a month before his death he predicted the very day on which he should depart this life, which happened accordingly. See a copy of the affidavit in the *Magazine of Knowledge*, &c. vol. ii. p. 300.

Besides the above extraordinary circumstances, which I have related only for the sake of those who will believe nothing without such kind of evidence, there are many others of a similar nature, the truth of which has been so fully attested, that none but an infidel can controvert them. These things, however, are not regarded by the members of the New Church, who look for and actually see *better* and *stronger* evidence of truth, than any miracle can afford. But as you, Sir, have called out for supernatural evidences, such as miracles, and the prediction of future events, here they are ; make what use you can of them. We shall see whether they produce that conviction in your mind, which you say miracles unavoidably produce. If they do not, you will then be left without excuse. Without wishing to be considered as a prophet, I will nevertheless venture to prophesy, in the words of the evangelist, of all those who require signs and miracles, “If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead,” Luke xvi. 31.

Thus have I gone through all the objections you have urged against Baron Swedenborg, on the score of his not working miracles as a proof of his divine mission. You have seen, and are bound to acknowledge, that neither *signs*, nor *wonders*, nor *miracles*, avail any thing towards pro-

ducing a rational conviction of truth in the understanding ; consequently that such things are not the proper evidences of a man's inspiration. You may also be well satisfied, if you will only be at the pains of examining, that the descriptions which the Baron gives of the spiritual world, exactly resemble those given by the prophets and apostles in the Old and New Testament ; which, if the one be true, is a strong presumptive proof that the other is also. This evidence, however, is only *external* ; yet it is of great weight so far as it goes. But we have better still, and that is of an *internal* nature ; being an evidence that arises from the spiritual sense of the Holy Word, by virtue of which we are enabled to see what was never seen before, viz. that there is not only *no real contradiction* in that volume of inspiration, but that *every part*, even the most minute, and apparently trivial and ludicrous circumstance therein recorded, is *divine and worthy of God*, containing within its bosom such treasures of divine wisdom as cannot be exhausted to eternity. It is the evidence arising from this internal sense of the Scripture, proved and confirmed by its literal sense, that principally authorizes us to acknowledge Baron Swedenborg not only as a divinely-commissioned messenger from the Lord, but as the *greatest and most enlightened* of any that has hitherto appeared in the world. For as John the Baptist was declared to be greater than any that had preceded him, on account of his being the immediate fore-runner of the Lord at his *first advent* ; so we consider Baron Swedenborg to be superior to John, or any other prophet or apostle, and that because he is the messenger appointed to announce the Lord's *second and most glorious advent*.

I know you will say, as you have already said, p. 17, that the "spiritual sense of the Scriptures cannot be attended to, till there be some evidence of the reality of such

a sense.” And, “If you say that I am incapable of perceiving this sense of the Scriptures, you must allow that you have no means of convincing me, or any others who are in the same situation with me, how well soever you, who have the illumination that I want, may be satisfied with respect to all your doctrines.” Were a blind man obstinately to deny the existence of the sun’s light, until he had some evidence of its reality, would you not pity him, and with a smile say, ‘Why, what evidence of the *light* can you have, while you are totally immersed in *darkness*? Go to the oculist, let him cure you of your blindness, and then you will have sufficient evidence of the reality of light.’ It is in this way I would (without meaning any offence) address myself to you, Sir, and to all others who are in a similar situation. Get the eyes of your spirit or understanding opened, and then you will have ocular demonstration of the actual existence of spiritual light; this being as obvious to the sight of a spiritual or intellectual eye, as natural light is to a bodily eye. It is true, the members of the New Church have no power to communicate to you a perception of the internal sense of the Word; but for ourselves, we as certainly know the reality of it, as you do the existence of the sun’s natural light. We also know how you may obtain such a perception, if you are so disposed; and that is solely by applying in sincerity of heart to the one only true God Jesus Christ, and by keeping his commandments. It is he alone that can open the eyes of the blind, and communicate that light which we all stand in need of for our direction to heaven. He giveth liberally to them that *ask him*, and upbraideth none. And “if any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God,” John vii. 17.

I cannot conclude this subject better than by referring you to a memorable passage in Baron Swedenborg’s

Arcana Cœlestia, n. 7290, where he treats of the nature of miracles. “ With respect to prodigies and signs, (says he) it is to be observed, that they were performed amongst such persons as were in external worship, and were not desirous of knowing any thing about internal worship ; for they, who were in such worship, were to be compelled by external means : hence it was, that miracles were performed amongst the Israelitish and Jewish people, who were merely in external worship, and in none that was internal. It was also necessary for them to be in external worship, when they would not be in that which is internal, in order that they might represent holy things in externals, and thus that communication might be given with heaven, as by something of a church ; for correspondences, representatives, and significatives, conjoin the natural world to the spiritual. Hence now it was, that so many miracles were performed among that nation. But with those who are in internal worship, that is, in charity and faith, miracles are not performed, being to such persons hurtful ; for miracles force or compel to believe, and whatsoever is of compulsion doth not remain, but is dissipated. The internal things of worship, which are faith and charity, ought to be implanted in freedom, for then they are appropriated ; and the things which are appropriated, remain : but the things which are implanted by compulsion, abide without the internal man in the external ; for nothing enters into the internal man, except by intellectual ideas, which are reasons, the ground which receives them there being the rational principle enlightened : hence it is, that no miracles are performed at this day. That they are also of a hurtful nature, may appear from the following consideration ; they compel to believe, and fix in the external man an idea that a thing is so or so ; if the internal man afterwards denies what the miracles have confirmed, then there commences an opposition and collision between the internal

and external man, and at length, when the ideas produced from miracles are dissipated, the conjunction of falshood and truth takes place, which is prophanation. Hence it is evident, how dangerous and hurtful miracles would be at this day in the church wherein the internals of worship are disclosed. These things are also signified by the Lord's words to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen me, Thomas, thou hast believed; blessed are they who see not, and believe," John, xx. 29; consequently they also are blessed, who believe, not by miracles. But miracles are not hurtful to those, who are in external worship without internal, for with such there cannot be any opposition between the internal and external man, thus no collision, and consequently no prophanation.

"That miracles do not contribute any thing towards faith, may appear sufficiently plain from the miracles performed with the Israelitish people in Egypt, and in the desert, in that they were utterly inefficacious of any such thing as faith amongst them: that people, although a short time before they saw so many miracles in Egypt, afterwards the Red Sea divided, and the Egyptians immersed therein, the pillar of a cloud going before them by day, and a pillar of fire by night, manna daily rained down from heaven, and although they saw the mount Sinai smoking, and heard Jehovah speaking thence, with other things, yet notwithstanding all this, and in the very midst of such things, they fell away from all faith, and from the worship of Jehovah to the worship of a calf, Exod. xxxii. 1, to the end. Hence it is evident, what effect miracles have. Still less would they be effectual at this day, when men do not acknowledge that there is any thing from the spiritual world, and when every spiritual effect is denied, and attributed to nature; for a negative principle universally prevails, in respect to the divine influx and government in the earths: wherefore in the present day, if the man of the church were to see the

most essentially divine miracles, he would first refer them to nature, and there defile them, afterwards he would reject them as phantasms or mere illusions, and lastly he would hold in derision all who should attribute them to a divine power, and not to nature. That miracles effect nothing, appears also from the Lord's words in Luke, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead," chap. xvi. 31.

To the above I will just add the following remark. Although the miracles recorded in the Word were, at the time of performance, of a *compulsive* nature, because presented before the *immediate view* of the spectator, yet now they are not so, because they do not manifestly operate upon the senses of the external man, and there remain, as before, but may gain admission to the internal man, and there be rationally understood.

ROBERT HINDMARSH.

LETTER II.

On the sole, supreme, and exclusive Divinity of Jesus Christ.

I NOW come to consider the grand, the fundamental, and most important subject in the whole system of Christian theology, namely, *the sole, supreme, and exclusive divinity of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* That it should be my lot to stand up in this public manner as an asserter and defender of this great truth, is an honour that I did not expect to be called to, particularly as I know there are others much better qualified for such an undertaking than myself. However, as I have been earnestly invited, by many sincere lovers of genuine truth, to the task of defending the sole divinity of our Saviour against the objections which you have raised in your *Letters to the Members of the New Church*; and as I believe there is no employment, in which the faculties of the human mind can be more worthily engaged, than in magnifying the adorable Creator of the universe, and in publishing his name among men as their Father, Redeemer, and Saviour; it is my intention to shew, according to the best of my ability, by a fair appeal to the Word of God, and a consistent interpretation of the same, 1. That all the arguments you have urged against the divinity of Jesus Christ, are no other than false reasonings from the mere *appearances* of things in the literal sense of the Word; and consequently that your whole system is built on the fallacy of the senses. 2. I will then prove, by Scripture and reason united, that the Lord-Man Jesus Christ is the one supreme and only God of heaven and earth, who in his Divine Human Person is, and may be called, JEHOVAH-MAN.

But as I cannot do this by my own strength, being utterly incapable, of myself, either to do a single action, or to think a single thought, it behoves me to apply for wisdom and ability to Him who is the fountain of life, and the giver of every good and perfect gift. May He therefore, who is the grand subject of this letter, assist in its production, and afterwards accompany it with his divine blessing.

Before I enter upon the subject, I shall beg leave to make a few preliminary remarks on your mode of addressing the members of the New Jerusalem; in which I propose to shew, that a Socinian has no right to the name of a Christian. As I cannot do this more effectually, than by addressing myself to one who avowedly professes himself to be such, you will excuse me, if, in opposing the *errors* of Socinianism, I also appear to oppose the *Socinian himself*. My design is not to wage war with the *person* of any man, but only with those *sentiments* which I think contrary to truth, and dangerous to Christian societies. But as sentiments or opinions, abstracted from the persons who maintain them, are considered by many as mere nothings; and the man and his opinions are so closely united, as, generally speaking, to be taken indiscriminately the one for the other; I hope I may be allowed without offence to make my observations to you as a *person*, while at the same time I would have them considered as directed against your *tenets* only.

Your first letter to the members of the New Church begins with these words: “My *fellow-Christians*, it is with peculiar pleasure that I address any class of persons by this appellation; and I am happy to observe, that you value Christianity *as much as I do*.”

\ Were an indifferent person to read this, he would naturally suppose, that it is from the great veneration in which you hold the person of Jesus Christ, that you thus

congratulate any set of people who make profession of his name. Such a reader would doubtless say to himself, 'Surely Dr. Priestly is a zealous advocate for the divinity of Christ; and finding that the world in general begins to think too lightly of his sacred person, he seizes the present opportunity of declaring his own faith in the Lord, and confirming others in the same duty.' This reflection would naturally occur to the mind of a person unacquainted with your peculiar tenets, on reading your first address to the members of the New Church: but were he to read your *Letters* throughout, it appears to me, he would have good reason to complain that you held out false colours at the beginning, by calling yourself a *Christian*, when in reality you have no just claim to the title.

Without intending the smallest offence, give me leave to ask you a few questions. In the first place, Why do you call yourself a Christian? Is it because you acknowledge the *divinity* of Christ? You answer, No. Is it because you believe the *history* of Christ, as related by the evangelists? You reply, Yes. Then by the same rule you are a Jew, if you believe the history of the Jews; and a Mahometan, if you believe the history of Mahomet. Christianity, if I apprehend it aright, is a system of religion that acknowledges the *divinity* of Christ, or in other words, that *Christ is God*. In what sense, then, can a person be a Christian, who does *not* acknowledge him as such? Does the bare belief of his being a *prophet*, like Moses or any other man, entitle you to be called after his name, any more than after the names of other prophets? Why, let me ask, do you call yourself a Christian, or a follower of Christ, if you believe Christ to be a *mere man*? I really think, Sir, you expose yourself in this particular more than you are aware of. You think it *idolatry* to worship Christ, and yet you consider it an *honour* to be called after his name!

If I dwell longer on this part of your address to the members of the New Church, than you expected, it is because I conceive it to be of great importance, that we know each other on the first setting out on this business; for as you have thought proper to send us a friendly message, it is expedient that an explanation of characters take place as soon as may be; otherwise we shall be talking to one another in the dark. Now, I can with safety and confidence take upon me to declare, in the name of all the members of the New Church, or New Jerusalem, that they are *Christians* in the proper sense of the word, and that for the following reason, viz. because they acknowledge no other God in heaven, or on earth, but the Lord *Jesus Christ*. Thus they derive their name from the God they worship, and from no other *inferior* being, be he man, or be he angel.

Having given you this candid and explicit character of the members of the New Church, with the simple, plain, and obvious reason of their laying claim to the denomination of *Christians*; I hope I may be allowed to make a little further inquiry into your religious profession, and again repeat my former question, Why do you style yourself a Christian? It is not because you acknowledge Christ to be the *only* and *supreme God*; for this you reject with horror, and consider as no less than blasphemy. It is not because you allow Christ to be a *sharer in divinity*; for this you also deny with all your might, and openly declare him to be no more than a *mere man*, like Moses or any other prophet. What then can be the reason? Perhaps it is because you happened to be born in a country, where the inhabitants call themselves Christians; and so the name being popular, you may think it prudent to retain it? Or perhaps it is (as before observed) because you believe the facts recorded in the New Testament, while the Jews give

credit only to those in the Old? But I hear you say, 'No, it is not for any of these reasons alone; it is also because Christ delivered such plain maxims and precepts of *morality* as no other prophet had done before him.' I answer, It is true, the Lord manifested his divine will more plainly than had been revealed by the prophets; but still the *principle* of all his words and actions may easily be traced through every book of the Old Testament, and is particularly to be seen in the ten commandments. Therefore the circumstance of Christ's teaching moral duties, alone, is no just reason why a person should be called after his name; seeing that previous to his appearance on earth the world was already in possession of more perfect maxims of morality, than the generality of mankind were disposed to put in practice.

From the above observations, you will readily perceive, Sir, that I do not acknowledge you as a *Christian* in the proper sense of that word; and yet, from principles of civility, I am willing to allow you every thing that I can, consistently with truth. You profess yourself to be a *Socinian*, that is, one who completely and to all intents and purposes denies the divinity of Jesus Christ, making him a mere man, like any of us. You even virtually accuse the *Arian* for exalting him to a rank in creation above the highest angel, as if he was not sufficiently degraded by being considered as the highest *creature*, without pulling him down below the rank of angels, and placing him on a level with yourself. So inveterate and personal appears to be your prejudice against Him, by whose sole goodness and power you was first created, and are still sustained in existence; in whom you now live, move, and have your being; and from whom you derive that very faculty of reasoning, which you exercise (I trust ignorantly) to His dishonour!

The Christian world in general acknowledges a trinity of divine persons; among whom it ranks as second in

dignity, though sometimes as equal, our blessed Lord. It is for this reason alone, viz. because they with their lips annex *something of divinity* to the person of Jesus Christ, that they are distinguished by the name of Christians. But as their division of the Deity into distinct persons, amounts to little less than a plain denial of the essential properties of the Godhead, they cannot be called Christians in the true sense of that word. If then they, who nominally ascribe divinity to the person of Christ, cannot with truth and propriety be ranked under the denomination of Christians, how much less can you, who openly, avowedly, and barefacedly degrade him below the character of an angel, and challenge him as a *mere man*! I do not by any means wish to offend you, Sir; but from the observations already made, I think even you yourself must see the impropriety of addressing the members of the New Church as *your fellow Christians*, seeing that they disagree with you *in all respects* concerning the person of Christ.

You believe that Christ is not possessed of any real divinity inherent in himself as his own, but only what may have been communicated to him by inspiration: We, on the contrary, believe, that Jesus Christ is God-Man, and Man-God, having essential divinity residing in him as his proper own, for which he is beholden to no other being either in heaven or earth. You believe he was no more than a prophet, like Moses and the rest, sent of God to teach mankind his will: We, on the contrary, believe he is more than a prophet, because, agreeably to his own words in Matt. xxiii. 34, *it is he that sends prophets*. You believe in the simple humanity of Christ, or in other words, that he was a mere man like yourself: We, on the contrary, believe in his Divine Humanity; in which he is the supreme and only God of heaven and earth, consequently the Only Man, and that all other men are men only by

derivation from him. You believe he was the Saviour of the world in no other sense than Moses was of the Israelites, that is, *under* another who is God: We, on the contrary, believe, that Jesus was the Saviour of the world, by virtue of his own personal power, and that salvation or redemption was effected by no other power or authority in heaven or earth, but his own divine arm. You consider him to be now the Son of Mary, if not of Joseph: but we consider such an idea as impious and blasphemous. You believe that divine honours ought not to be paid to him: We, on the contrary, account all worship directed to any other than to Jesus Christ, to be downright idolatry. In short, though you do not with your lips expressly deny that he is Lord* and Master, you actually embrace every opportunity to degrade and dishonour him: while the members of the New and True Christian Church unite every faculty of their souls to exalt his name alone, to celebrate his praise alone, and to hail him alone as the one God over all, blessed for ever.

Such being the contrast between the Christianity professed by Socinians, and that of the New Jerusalem, I leave you and all the world to judge with what propriety or truth you style us *your fellow Christians*.

Having thus animadverted on your way of addressing us, I now proceed to consider the arguments you have brought against the divinity of Jesus Christ, and to shew that they are all fallacious, being grounded in the mere *appearances* of truth in the literal sense of the Word.

* It is remarkable, that Dr. Priestley no where in his *Letters* calls Jesus *Lord*. Whenever that expression is mentioned by him, it is always by way of quotation either from the Scriptures, or from Baron Swedenborg's writings, and never proceeds from him as an effect of his own sentiments. This circumstance brings to my recollection the words of Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 3: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." The Holy Ghost is the divine proceeding from Jesus; the sin against the Holy Ghost is the denial of his divinity; Arians and Socinians are guilty of this; therefore I judge that no Arian or Socinian can call Jesus *Lord*, without feeling a certain internal repugnance to the expression.

Page 18, you say, "I own that when I first heard of this tenet of your's, that Jesus Christ was the same person with God the Father, and that there is no other God than he, I was exceedingly surprized." That you was exceedingly surprized on hearing it asserted, that Jesus Christ is the same person with God the Father, and that there is no other God than he, I make no doubt; and I should not have wondered much, had you gone backward and fallen to the ground, as the band of armed men did, when Jesus declared the same thing by saying, *I Am*, John xviii. 6. But what will you say or do, when you find this grand truth proved and demonstrated beyond the shadow of contradiction, as I hope, by the divine mercy of the Lord, I shall be enabled to do in the following pages!

"It is certainly no uncommon thing," you say, p. 19, "for the same thing, or the same person, to be signified by two different names, Jesus, for example, and Christ, Simon and Peter; but then we always find, that the same character and description will apply to both, and except the literal significations of the term be referred to, we may, in any sentence substitute the one in the place of the other; every thing that can be asserted of the one, being equally true of the other. Nothing is ever asserted concerning either of them, that is incompatible with the other; *nor will any speaker or writer, knowing the use of language, ever connect two names which denote only the same person by the conjunctive particle and.* We say, for example, that Peter and John did this or that; but we never say, that Simon and Peter, Jesus and Christ, did this, using the plural number; because Peter and John are different persons. But Simon and Peter, Jesus and Christ, are the same persons; and therefore we naturally say Simon or Peter, Jesus or Christ, or else, joining the names, we say, Simon Peter, or Jesus Christ, did this or that, using the singular num-

ber only. Now look through the whole New Testament, where God and Christ are spoken of, and you will find by these plain rules concerning the use of words, which every body understands, and in speaking or writing strictly conforms to, that *God* and *Christ*, in the ideas of the persons who wrote those books, were as different persons as Christ and Peter; James and John."

The above argument, however plausible it may appear to some at first sight, with respect to the strictness of grammatical diction, is nevertheless not a true one, because it is founded on false premises. To say that "no speaker or writer, knowing the use of language, ever connects two names which denote only the same person by the conjunctive particle *and*," is an assertion that militates against, and is confuted by perhaps a thousand passages in the Holy Scriptures, as well as in the apostolic writings. I shall produce only a few, which will be sufficient to shew your inattention to the *language of inspiration*, and how vain a thing it is to build a system of theology upon such a sandy foundation as the mere rules of grammar.

1. Abraham said to his servant, "I will make thee swear by the God of heaven *and* the God of the earth," Gen. xxiv. 3. Here the God of heaven and the God of the earth are certainly the *same person*; and yet they are connected together by the conjunctive particle *and*. See also Gen. xxxi. 53. Chap. xxxii. 9. Exod. iv. 5.

2. It is said in the Apocalypse, that Jesus Christ "hath made us kings and priests unto God *and* his Father," chap. i. 6. God and the Father are undoubtedly one and the same person; but if we are to form our doctrine from *conjunctive particles*, we must make two distinct persons of them.

3. John the Apocalyptist says to the seven churches in Asia, "Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is,

and which was, and which is to come; *and* from Jesus Christ," Apoc. i. 4, 5. Now in verse 8 of the same chapter, the Lord Jesus saith, "I am Alpha *and* Omega, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Whence it follows, that he which is, and which was, and which is to come, and Jesus Christ, are one and the same person, notwithstanding the interposition of the conjunctive particle *and*.

4. So again, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, *and* of his Christ, and *he* shall reign for ever and ever," Apoc. xi. 15. Here although it is said, *the Lord AND his Christ*, as if they were two distinct persons, yet the passage cannot be so understood, as is evident from the words immediately following, wherein both Lord and Christ are united in one person, viz. *and HE shall reign for ever and ever*. Besides, the term *Lord* is constantly applied to Jesus Christ in the New Testament as his peculiar and distinguishing title, of which he was also pleased to express his approbation in these words; "Ye call me Master, and *Lord*; and ye say well, for so I am," John xiii. 13.

5. "And they remembered, that God was their Rock, *and* the high God their Redeemer," psalm lxxviii. 35. Here again God the Rock and the high God the Redeemer are one and the same person.

6. The apostle James, in his general epistle, says, "Pure religion, and undefiled before God *and* the Father is this," &c. James i. 27. Paul saith, that "Jesus Christ gave himself for our sins, according to the will of God *and* our Father," Gal. i. 4. "Giving thanks always for all things unto God *and* the Father," Ephes. v. 20. "Now unto God *and* our Father be glory for ever and ever, Amen," Philip. iv. 20. "We give thanks to God, *and* the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," Col. i. 3. "That their

hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God *and* of the Father, *and* of Christ," Col. ii. 2. "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God *and* the Father by him," Col. iii. 17. "Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God, *and* our Father," 1. Thess. i. 3. "Now God himself, *and* our Father, *and* our Lord Jesus Christ direct* our way unto you," 1 Thess. iii. 11.—In all these passages, and many others of a similar kind which might be adduced, God and the Father are spoken of *apparently* as distinct beings or persons; and in some of them Jesus Christ is no more distinguished from the Father, than the Father, is from himself; for the conjunctive particle *and*, on which you lay so much stress, is equally interposed between all the three names. Thus the mystery of the incarnation is said to be the mystery of God, *and* of the Father, *and* of Christ. And Paul prays to be directed by God, *and* by the Father, *and* by the Lord Jesus Christ.

7. Again, "The great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil *and* satan," Apoc. xii. 9. chap. xx. 2. Here the terms *devil* and *satan* are applied to one and the same dragon: and it is called the devil *and* satan,

* It is remarkable that the Greek word *καλεῖσθαι*, *may he direct*, is the third person singular of the 1 aor. opt. and not the third person plural. If God and Jesus Christ were two distinct persons, it would be more grammatical to use a plural verb: but as they are only one person, therefore it is with great propriety said in the singular number, "Now God himself, and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ (*καλεῖσθαι*) direct our way unto you." Something similar to this is found in the first chapter of Genesis, verse 1, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." In the Hebrew the noun *אלהים Elohim*, is plural, *Dii, the Gods*, and the verb *ברא bara*, is singular, *creavit, he created*; literally in English, *The Gods [he] created the heavens and the earth*. The reason of this peculiarity in the Hebrew language, is to shew, that the regeneration of man as to his internal and external, (which is meant by the creation of the heavens and the earth,) although conducted through the mediation of *angels and spirits*, (called Gods,) is yet after all effected by the *Lord alone*.

not the devil *or* satan, as you seem to think it should be, in order to be conformable to the rules of grammar, which is a science, not of things, but of mere words.

Perhaps you will say, that the Greek word *καί* ought, in the foregoing passages, to have been translated *even*, instead of *and*; in which case the phrase *God AND the Father* will read, *God EVEN the Father*; and the *devil AND satan* will be *the devil EVEN satan*. But this is granting more than I ask, and in fact giving up the point; for then instead of being, *God, AND the Father, AND Jesus Christ*, it would uniformly be, *God, EVEN the Father, EVEN Jesus Christ*, agreeable to the translation of 2 Cor. i. 3; and 1 Thess. iii. 13. So that, take the words which way you please, you are reduced to a perfect dilemma. If you make choice of the affirmative conjunction *even*, instead of *and*, you then acknowledge the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ, and that he is the high God, *even* the Father; but if, as I expect, you would rather retain the conjunctive particle *and*, you must at least be conscious, that your observations concerning the use of that word in the Scriptures are not well founded.

8. In the following passage the preposititon *from* is used: "Then Jehovah* rained upon Sodom, and upon Gomorrah, brimstone and fire *from* Jehovah out of heaven," Gen. xix. 24. Hence it appears as if there were two Jehovahs, the one raining brimstone and fire from the other; which must necessarily embarrass the person, who confines his ideas to the mere literal expressions. Such a one, in a thousand instances, must either give up his understanding to be the tool of a blind faith, or else he must in his own mind conclude that the inspired writers *did not know the*

* The English translation has the word *Lord*, instead of *Jehovah*, in this and other passages of the Old Testament. But I think it best to retain the word *Jehovah*, as in the original Hebrew.

use of language, or, what is worse than all, he must absolutely deny the sanctity and divinity of the Word.

The next thing I have to animadvert upon, is your assertion, that “through the whole New Testament, where God and Christ are spoken of, they are, in the ideas of the persons who wrote those books, as different persons as Christ and Peter, James and John.” There is nothing like bringing you to the test. Let us see what the language of the New Testament is in this matter. If I have any understanding at all, the great God and our Lord Jesus Christ must, in the following passages, be *one and the same person*, according to the idea of the writers.

1. In the Apocalypse it is said, “We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come, because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned,” chap. xi. 17. “I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God,” chap. xii. 10. “Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints,” chap. xv. 3. “Allelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth,” chap. xix. 6. In these passages salvation, and power, and the kingdom, are ascribed to the Lord God omnipotent. But in the following the *very same things* are ascribed to Jesus Christ, who is also called the Lamb. Jesus says, “I am Alpha and Omega, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty,” Apoc. i. 8. “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever,” chap. xi. 15. “The Lamb shall overcome them; for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings,” chap. xvii. 14. “Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb,” chap. vii. 10. “The Lamb which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them,” verse 17.

Now let any unprejudiced person compare the above passages together, and he cannot but acknowledge, that in the idea of the writer God and the Lamb, or God and Jesus Christ, are *one and the same person*. It is said of God, that he *is, was, and is to come* : the same is said of Jesus Christ. God is called *Almighty* : so is Jesus Christ. God is said to have taken his great power, and to *reign as King of saints* : of Christ it is said, that the *kingdoms are his, and he shall reign for ever and ever* ; and of the Lamb, that *he is in the midst of the throne, Lord of lords, and King of kings*. Under all these circumstances, is it possible that God and Christ can be two different persons ? Can we for a moment suppose, that all the hosts of heaven should agree in dividing their worship between two Kings, two Lords, two Almighty, two First Causes, two Alphas and Omegas ?—The very idea shocks me beyond description, and prevents my pursuing it any further.

2. “The *Lord God* of the holy prophets sent *his angel* to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done,” Apoc. xxii. 6. In verse 16 of the same chapter it is said, “*I Jesus* have sent *mine angel* to testify unto you these things in the churches.” As these two passages occur so near to each other, in one chapter, I cannot think with you, that in the idea of the writer “God and Christ are as different persons as James and John ;” but have a clear perception given me to see, that the Lord God of the holy prophets and Jesus are one and the same divine person.

3. “And I saw no temple in the New Jerusalem, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it,” Apoc. xxi. 22. A temple is *one single* building : how then can the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb constitute that *one single* building, if they are divided into two different and distinct persons ? But if we consider them as

united in one person, then we shall plainly see, that the body of Jesus is that glorious temple. See John ii. 21.

4. In the New Jerusalem "there shall be no night, and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the *Lord God* giveth them light," Apoc. xxii. 5. In the preceding chapter it is said, "The *Lamb* is the light thereof," Apoc. xxi. 23. Whence I conclude, that the Lord God and the Lamb are the same person, and in the idea of the writer must have been considered as such.

5. "Blessed are they which are called to the *marriage-supper of the Lamb*," Apoc. xix. 9. In the 17th verse of the same chapter it is said, "Come and gather yourselves together unto the *supper of the great God*." The marriage-supper of the Lamb, and the supper of the great God, are the same thing; therefore the Lamb and the great God are one and the same person.

6. "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ: *This is the true God*, and eternal life," 1 John v. 20. Here it is evident, that John made no distinction between Jesus Christ and God; for he expressly says, that he is the true God and eternal life. And to caution us against worshipping any other than Jesus Christ, he immediately adds, "Little children, keep yourselves from *idols*," verse 21.

7. Jesus says, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will *I do*, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, *I will do it*," John xiv. 13, 14. In chapter xvi. 23, he says, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, *he* will give it you." If there be any consistency in the views or ideas of the speaker and writer, these passages, compared together, evidently prove that Jesus himself was the Father.

8. Lastly, Jesus said, "I and my Father are *one*," John x. 30. "Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known *me* Philip? He that hath seen *me*, hath seen the *Father*," John xiv. 8, 9. There needs no further proof in this matter; for Jesus himself expressly declares, that he and the Father are one and the same person. Philip, it seems, entertained an idea, as many others have done since him, that God the Father was a distinct person from Jesus; and observing that the Lord generally spake in parables, sometimes in pretty plain terms, and at other times obscurely, he was determined to put a direct question to him about the Father. He did so, and our Lord's answer was as explicit as it could be: "He that hath seen *me*, hath seen the *Father*." Still, however, the Lord saw that the church at that time was incapable of receiving a full and clear revelation of this greatest and most sublime of all truths; therefore he continued to speak in parables and proverbs, reserving till a future day the glorious manifestation of himself, as being the *Everlasting Father*, as well as the *Son* that was born *in time*. "These things," says he, "have I spoken unto you in proverbs: the time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but *I shall shew you plainly of the Father*," John xvi. 25. The great day alluded to, in which he no longer speaks in proverbs, is the present; we now know for a certainty, who is the Father, having seen him more clearly and satisfactorily than ever Philip did; and for the first time the present day beholds the accomplishment of Isaiah's prophecy concerning the person of Jesus, "Unto us a *Child* is born, unto us a *Son* is given, and the *government* shall be upon *his shoulder*; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, *God*, Hero, *Father of eternity*, Prince of peace," Isaiah ix. 6.

* * *

In page 20 you say, “ Christ uniformly speaks of himself as having been sent from God, just as much as John the Baptist was ; so that if the person *sending* can be the same with the person *sent*, John the Baptist may be God as well as Jesus Christ. I may say that I go from one place to another, but it is manifestly improper to say that I *send* myself from one place to another. On your principles, Christ and his apostles might be the same persons. For Christ, addressing himself to his Father, says, John xvii. 18, *As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.* It is evident, therefore, that Christ was a person as different from him whom he addressed as his *Father*, as his disciples were different from himself.”

The whole of this objection arises from the want of knowing the difference between natural and spiritual language, and that spiritual ideas, in their descent from heaven, clothe themselves with such expressions as are accommodated to the state of man in the natural world. The garments of a man are not the real man ; so neither is the literal sense of the Word, in many cases, real naked truth, but truth clothed with appearances, which may indeed prove a stumbling-block to some, while to others they administer the delights of use. That Jesus Christ, although said to be *sent* by God the Father, was yet that very Father, may plainly appear from due attention to, and a right understanding of, the holy Scriptures.

In all places where the Lord is said to be sent by the Father, we are to understand that God himself descended into the world as divine truth ; which descent was effected by the assumption of the Humanity from the Virgin Mary. For the sake of distinction, the Scriptures call divine good the Father, and divine truth the Son ; because divine truth

proceeds from divine good, comparatively as a son proceeds from a father. Hence it is said, that the *Son* of God descended, or was sent by the Father, meaning that God assumed the Humanity more particularly in respect to *divine truth*, than to divine good, although the latter was not separated from the former. By the word *sent* is also signified the same thing as *angel*; for the word *angel* in the original language signifies *sent*; as in Isaiah, “The *angel* of his presence saved them,” chap. lxiii. 9; that is, divine truth *proceeding from* Jehovah saved them. The power of salvation is not predicable of any one but a Divine Being, nor of any thing but a divine attribute.

Jesus said to his disciples, “It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, *I will send him unto you*,” John xvi. 7. Here Jesus promises to *send* the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit. Afterwards, “Jesus *breathed* on his disciples, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit,” John xx. 22. From which it is plain, that by the Holy Spirit is meant something proceeding from Jesus; and that *sending* signifies the same as *breathing* or *proceeding*. Again, the Lord having told his disciples, that he would *send* them *another Comforter*, which should abide with them for ever, immediately adds, “I will not leave you comfortless, *I will come to you*,” John xiv. 18. He likewise says, “And lo, *I am with you alway* even unto the end of the world,” Matt. xxviii. 20. No terms can be more express than these; which therefore clearly and undeniably prove, that the person *sending* and the person *sent* are, in this instance at least, one and the same Being.

But you say, that, according to this way of speaking, John the Baptist may be God, as well as Jesus Christ, because it is equally said of him, that he was sent by God: also that Christ and his apostles may be the same persons,

because they were sent by him : and it is very natural for you to ask, ‘ How shall we know whether they are, or not ?’ I will tell you : the method is easy and simple. Look through the gospels, look through the epistles, look through the Apocalypse, or any part of Scripture, and see whether John the Baptist, or any of the apostles, is any where called Jehovah, Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the Ending, who is, who was, and who is to come, the Almighty, the I Am, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the King of kings, and Lord of lords. If you can find none of these appellations given to any of them, you may rest assured they are neither God nor Christ, but that in dignity of person they all fall infinitely short of Him who alone is God-man. John the Baptist says, “ *I am not the Christ* : he must increase, but I must decrease : he that cometh from above, is above all,” John iii. 28, 30, 31. He that is *above all*, must be *God alone*. “ Behold the Lamb of God that *taketh away the sin* of the world,” John i. 29. Who can *take away sins* but God ? “ The Son Man hath power on earth to *forgive sins*,” Matt. ix. 6. “ None can *forgive sins*, but *God alone*,” Luke v. 21. Therefore Jesus Christ alone is God.

There is no impropriety, you observe, in saying, “ that I go from one place to another ;” but a manifest one, you think, to say, “ that I *send* myself from one place to another.” Strange as this may appear to you, and difficult of comprehension, it is nevertheless true, and what you yourself have actually done. By sending me your *Letters to the Members of the New Jerusalem*, you have in fact *sent yourself*, and I have you this moment before me. I do not so much consider your material *body* to be Dr. Priestley, as your *soul* which is within that body ; and I know the soul or mind to consist of will and understanding,

or affection and thought, and nothing else. Now I find your book contains your will and understanding, or your affection and thought, just as your person contains them : insomuch that it may with propriety be called *another self*, existing *without yourself*, or Dr. Priestley *proceeding from Dr. Priestley*. Thus whenever Dr. Priestley, or any other person, publishes a book of his own writing, he thereby actually *sends himself* into the world ; for the works of every man both contain and exhibit the real man, his *will* being therein by virtue of the design, motive, or end in view, and his *understanding* by virtue of the wisdom or thought whereby he expresses himself, as means to promote that end. There is this difference, however, between Dr. Priestley as a *man* or *person*, and Dr. Priestley as a *book* or *work*. As a *man*, he may change his state, and, rejecting his present errors, receive new life and new wisdom from the Lord. But as a *book*, or *work*, he cannot ; that remains fixed and permanent, as an eternal monument of his present and past state of mind, to the production of which all the interior principles of his life conspired.

To render the subject now under discussion a little more familiar and plain, I will just relate a fact, which very lately happened : and you know facts are often more powerful than arguments. A gentleman came into my house, and seeing a *book* in my hand, said without any apparent reflection, “ *Whom* have you there ? ” “ Is *that* Dr. Priestley ? or *who* else is it ? ” I told him, *it was Dr. Priestley*, and that I was *hearing* what he had to *say* against *Baron Swedenborg*. “ Well,” added he, “ and what *does he say* ? ” When the gentleman left me, I began to reflect on his mode of accosting me, and I soon found, that it is the *common language of every person*, to speak precisely in the same manner. Personification is congenial to the

human mind ; the ancients were fond of it, and the moderns are still in the habit of it, without being always conscious of the circumstance. “ *Whom,*” i. e. *what person*, (not *what book*,) “ have you there?—O, I see you have Dr. Priestley in your hand,” (not the *writings* or *book* of Dr. Priestley.) “ What does he say against *Baron Swedenborg* ?” (Not what *has he written* against the *writings* of Baron Swedenborg?) Such is the most familiar and common mode of speech. The reason of this personification is, because there is an influx general from the spiritual world into the minds of men, leading and directing them to reduce every thing to its *first principles*, and thus in their very language to return effects back again to their causes, from whence they proceeded ; so that in every effect they may contemplate the cause, and in every cause the end, which is man. This general influx is derived from one universal, which inculcates the unity of God, and teaches that, as all things came forth from him, so with respect to uses they must all return back to him ; “ for all things were created by him and for him,” Col. i. 16.

The common consent of mankind, in speaking of the *works* of any person, exactly as if they were the *person himself*, and this without any previous agreement among themselves to do so, is therefore to me a plain and clear demonstration, that such language is agreeable to the order impressed on creation, and that it is an effect produced in the natural world from causes originating in the spiritual world, where all ideas spontaneously fall into *corresponding* natural expressions.

It is for this reason, that the sacred Scriptures, being written according to the laws of the spiritual world, do frequently speak of what proceeds from the Divine Being as though it were the Divine Being himself. Thus to the Holy Spirit, which is the divine proceeding of the Lord,

John xx. 22, the same attributes and powers are ascribed, as to the Lord himself. Lying to the *Holy Ghost* is called lying unto *God*, Acts v. 3, 4. He that is born of the *Spirit*, John iii. 5, 8, is said to be born of *God*, John i. 13. Not to mention many other passages to the same effect. Again, the historical part of the Word is called *Moses*, Luke xvi. 31. chap xxiv. 27. In like manner the Word of God itself, which proceeded from God, is also called *God*, John i. 1. It is further described as a *Man*, with eyes like a flame of fire, and having on his head many crowns, whose name is *King of kings*, and *Lord of lords*, Apoc. xix. 12 to 16.

As you seem to think there is such a great impropriety in saying, *God sent himself* into the world, though none in supposing that he *sent another person*, a prophet, for instance; I will reason a little with you on your own ground. To *send* a messenger on any errand, literally implies, that the person *sending* is at some distance from the persons to whom the message is *sent*. God is the *sender*, and men the persons to whom *sent*. Now you certainly acknowledge the *omnipresence* of God, that he is equally present here and every where. With what propriety then, let me ask, can it be said on your principles, that *God sends* a messenger to those, with whom he is to the full as present as with any messenger whom he can possibly send? He is already present with them, before the messenger arrives; nay, at the very moment he sends him. To *send* further implies, in the mere literal sense of the word, that the messenger sent *quits* the presence of him who sends, and during his journey is in an intermediate state between the *sender* and the persons to whom he is *sent*. But this is absolutely impossible in respect to him who is *omnipresent*, for if God, as you say, p. 50, fills infinite space, being also in the *form of infinite space*, then

the *sending* of any messenger to mankind can be nothing more than sending him from *one part of himself* to *another part of himself*; or, what is the same thing in your idea, from *one part of infinite space* to *another part of the same infinite space*. The doctrine, therefore, which you maintain from the mere literal and grammatical sense of Scripture, is on the very face of it the most absurd, unphilosophical, and impossible, than can be supposed. For take it which way you will, look at it in every direction which your *hypothesis of mere words, and space, and matter*, will permit, and after all you must confess it amounts to nothing. If your ideas are derived from *words*, they will end in *words*; if from *space*, they will be dissipated like *space*; and if from *matter*, they will terminate in the *grave*.

All these things put together, and well considered, work, at least in my mind, a full and clear conviction, that God the *sender*, and Jesus Christ the *sent*, are always in the idea, and in many cases in the express language of Scripture, one and the same Divine Being. But, for your satisfaction, if you still doubt it, I will bring further proof in what follows.

* * *

Because Jesus, previous to his glorification, or union with the Father, prayed to him *in all appearance* as to a person distinct from himself; therefore you conclude, that he could not *in reality* be that Father. “Christ,” you say, p. 21, “constantly prayed to the person whom he called his Father, and he directed his disciples to pray to the same person. *Father*, says he, John xvii. 1, *glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee*. Was Jesus then only speaking to himself? Sometimes, no doubt, persons do so; but not in this manner.” You acknowledge, then, that a person may and does speak to himself: but you say

not in that manner. It is a pity but you had told us in *what manner* a man may speak to himself. David addresses his soul in the following manner. “Bless Jehovah, *O my soul*; and all that is *within me*, bless his holy name. Bless Jehovah, *O my soul*, and forget not all his benefits; who forgiveth all *thine* iniquities; who healeth all *thy* diseases; who redeemeth *thy* life from destruction; who crowneth *thee* with loving-kindness and tender mercies; who satisfieth *thy* mouth with good things, so that *thy* youth is renewed like the eagles.” Psalm ciii. 1 to 5. “Why art *thou* cast down, *O my soul*? And why art *thou* disquieted *within me*?” Psalm xlii. 5, 11. xliii. 5. David here evidently speaks to his soul, and to all that is within him. Will you therefore infer, that David and his soul must necessarily be two different persons? As well may you do this, as conclude, that Jesus and the Father within him were two, merely because he prayed to him *as if* he were different from him.

As this seems to be one of your greatest objections to Christ being God, viz. his praying to him as to a different person, it may be proper to explain the reason of it; for until we understand something of that wonderful circumstance, we may reason to eternity, and never be a whit the wiser. And perhaps I cannot do it better, than by comparing it to the regeneration of an individual man. Every man, you know, consists of an internal and an external. The internal we will here call enlightened reason, and the external man’s vicious propensities or inclinations. This comparison is also just, for the internal of the mind is the seat of rationality, and the external of the mind is the seat of vice or evil. Now this view of a single individual man at once presents the idea of an *apparent duality*, although we know for a certainty that both the internal and external constitute only *one man*.

Whenever a person is instigated by his lusts to commit a crime, the inclination commences in the external man, and would immediately rush into action, were it not for the check received from reason in the internal, which dictates to him, that the evil ought not to be done. If the man is disposed to be virtuous, he will constantly *have recourse* to this reason; and particularly in times of danger from his passions, he will *appeal* to reason, and as it were *cry out* with earnestness for all the powers which his rational faculty can afford him in the subjection of his evil propensities. Now what is all this, but the external of a man *praying* to the internal of the same man? And when by divine assistance he has successively resisted and overcome those evil inclinations, he at length comes into the habit and practice of virtue, so that it may with truth be said, his internal and external are united, or in other words, the man is regenerated.

The above is a faint and very imperfect image of the Lord's glorification, or union with the Father. His internal was Jehovah, purity itself, life itself; his external was a Humanity or body derived from the Mother Mary, and consequently infirm, subject to temptations, hunger, thirst, death. By virtue of inclinations hereditarily received from the Mother, he was tempted to evils of various kinds, being in this respect like another man. But by virtue of the Divinity within him, in which he differed from every other man, he constantly resisted, opposed, overcame, and finally exterminated from his Humanity every thing derived from Mary. During this process, it was necessary for his external man, when assaulted by temptations, to pray to his internal man for that aid and assistance which no other power or principle could afford. It was in respect to his external man, previous to its full union with his internal man, that he says, that *of himself he could do nothing*,

and that *the Father is greater than he* : for his internal being always perfectly divine, could not but be greater, while the external remained unglorified. But when the internal flowed fully into the external, which it could do when all hereditary evil or the maternal infirmities were exterminated therefrom, then the external was also made fully divine, or glorified, that is, perfectly united with the internal, so that the Lord is in all respects equal to the Father, being absolutely one and the same as the Father. This is what we are to understand by *all power being given unto him in heaven and in earth*, Matt. xxviii. 18.

But there is another reason why the Lord prayed to the Father as to a person different from himself; and that is, because he came into the world not only to effect our redemption by subduing the powers of hell which prevailed at that time, but also to teach us for ever after how *we* ought to pray. The whole process of man's regeneration is only a faint image of the Lord's glorification. If he had not been glorified, we could not be regenerated; if he had not prayed to the Father, we should not have known how to pray; for in all things he is our head and pattern. It may indeed appear, as if two distinct principles of intelligence were necessarily implied in all the prayers which the Lord uttered, the one principle being that which dictated the prayer, and the other that to which the prayer was directed. But this is a *mere appearance*, and not *really* so, as will be proved in another place, when I come to speak more particularly of the one and only divine source of all intelligence. So again it *appears* in all our prayers, as if there were a principle of intelligence *belonging to us* as our *proper own*, absolutely *distinct* and *undervied* from that of the one intellectual Being to whom we pray. But this also is a *mere appearance*, and a fallacy arising from

our *interior senses*.* A man can *of himself* no more pray to the Lord, than he can hold the sun in his hand. It is the Lord alone in us that *prays to himself*; although it is done *apparently from the man*; and no other prayer can have the least possible degree of efficacy or virtue in it. It is the same with *praise, thanksgiving*, and every other part of *divine worship*, which are only so far real acts of worship, and acceptable to the Lord, as the Lord himself is in them. So true are the Lord's words, "No man can come unto me, except it were *given unto him of my Father*," John vi. 65. "As the branch cannot bear fruit *of itself*, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. For *without me* ye can *do nothing*. If ye abide in me, and *my words* abide in you, ye shall *ask* what ye will, and it shall be done unto you," John xv. 4, 5, 7. Thus the Lord is the *Last*, as well as the *First*, the *Omega* as well as the *Alpha*, the All and in all. All comes *from him*; all is directed *to him*; and from *first to last* it is the Lord alone who operates in us and by us, from, to, and for himself. See Col. i. 16.

As I am now on the subject of prayer, I will here introduce a remark concerning our Lord's words in John xvi. 23, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." The construction generally put upon this passage is, that we ought to pray to the Father *for the sake of the Son*, thus to the Father out of, and separate from the Son. Hence the prayers of almost all Christian

* It is generally supposed, that man is endued with only the five bodily senses of *seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching*. But he is also in the enjoyment of an equal number of spiritual senses, perfectly distinct from the former, though united together by correspondence. The sense of *seeing* corresponds to the affection of *understanding* and *becoming wise*; the sense of *hearing*, to the affection of *learning*, and also *obedience*; the sense of *smelling*, to the affection of *perceiving*; the sense of *tasting*, to the affection of *knowing*, or of *science*; and the sense of *touching*, in general to the affection of *what is good*.

congregations are addressed to the Father alone, and conclude with words to this effect, *through Jesus Christ, or for the sake of Jesus Christ, his sufferings, death, and merits, &c. &c.* But that this is not praying *in his name*, nor according to *his directions*, is very plain from the *form of supplication*, usually called the *Lord's prayer*, which he dictated to his disciples, when they asked him to teach them how to pray. "After this manner," says he, "pray ye, *Our Father*, who art in the heavens," &c. This, compared with the above-mentioned passage in John, clearly points out, that the name of Jesus is *Father*; which is further confirmed by the prophet Isaiah, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and his *name* shall be called the *Everlasting Father*;" chap. ix. 6. To pray therefore in his name, means to call upon him in the true spirit of prayer as our heavenly *Father*, who can alone supply all our necessities, alone redeem, regenerate, and save. And this we are to do, not for the sake of any person or thing *distinct from him*, but as the psalmist David expresses it, *for his mercy's sake*, Psalm vi. 4; or *for his name's sake*, Psalm xxv. 11; or as the prophet says, *for his own sake*, Isa. xliii. 25. Jesus said to his disciples, "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive. The time cometh, when I shall shew you plainly of the Father. At *that day* ye shall ask *in my name*: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you; *for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me*," John xvi. 24 to 27. From all which it is evident, that Jesus himself is the Father; and that when the time should come for him to be plainly known as such, the members of his true Christian church would no longer consider him as a *Mediator* or *Intercessor* distinct from the Father, but pray to him as the *Father himself* who loveth them.

I am aware that many of these sentiments will appear novel, because hitherto the learned as well as the simple-minded have been used to consider things in a very different point of view ; not knowing the true nature either of the Divine Being, or of the existence of man as a rational and free agent by continual derivation from him, nor wherein human liberty essentially consists, and how it is compatible with the sovereignty of him in whose hands is the disposal of all events from the day of creation to eternity. To Baron Swedenborg, as an instrument in the Lord's hands, the present age is indebted for the discovery of these more than metaphysical truths ; and I freely acknowledge, that all my present views have been opened in my mind through the medium of his writings, which appear to me to contain more true and solid wisdom, than the writings of all philosophers and all divines, in all ages, put together. I therefore from the sincerity of my heart, and as an act of the greatest friendship I am capable of shewing, earnestly recommend the cool, deliberate, unprejudiced, attentive *study* of them to Dr. Priestley, and all others into whose hands this *Defence of the New Church* may fall.

* * *

To return again to your objections. You go on, in p. 21, to observe as follows, “ When Christ directed his disciples to pray to their *Father who seeth in secret*, he surely did not mean that they should pray to himself. If he did, he certainly did not speak very intelligibly.” If the *seeing in secret* is a proof of divinity, and of being the Father, then Jesus is the divine Father ; for he *knew all men*, John ii. 24. He *saw Nathanael* before Philip called him, *when he was under the fig-tree*, John i. 48. He *knew their thoughts*, Luke vi. 8 ; and many other places. I admit that such language as the Lord uses may not be intelligible

to some minds ; for “ he hath *blinded their eyes*, and *hardened their hearts*, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them,” John xii. 40. That is, he *permits* some persons to remain in darkness, to prevent their being guilty of profanation, for no one can profane a thing, of which he is ignorant. But a time was to come, when he would speak more plainly of the Father, than ever he had done ; when he would reveal to mankind, without any shadow of doubt, that he himself was the Father as well as the Son ; and then men would see and understand more clearly than heretofore all that he had said when he was in the world. That day is at length come, and we have seen it.

You continue in the same page, “ Besides, he plainly distinguishes between praying to the Father, and asking any thing of himself, when he says, John xvi. 23, ‘ *In that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.*’ Was such language as this, which he constantly uses, calculated to lead the disciples to consider the Father and himself as the same person ?” I answer, It certainly was not calculated to give them an *immediate* and *full* idea of his being the Father ; for this idea can only be brought about *gradually*. Men must first believe Jesus to be the *Son of God*, before they are capable of acknowledging him as *God the Father himself*. The disciples in general entertained an idea, that Jesus was a person distinct from the Father, a kind of mediator or intercessor between God and them, according to the vulgar acceptation of the term. Hence Martha, in hopes that Jesus would intercede with the Father for the restoration of her brother Lazarus, said to him, “ I know, that whatsoever thou wilt *ask of God*, God will give it thee,” John xi. 22. But as our

Lord on that occasion gave her to understand, that he was more than a mere mediator and intercessor, being *life in himself*, consequently the Father himself, ver. 25, 26 ; so in the present case he informs his disciples, that on a future day the church would be blessed with a more full discovery of his divine nature and person, and then that the members thereof would no longer regard him as a *mere intercessor* in their behalf to *another Being* called the Father, and pray to him *in that capacity*, but would immediately approach him as the Father himself in the Humanity, or as the one true God manifested in the flesh : and therefore he adds, in ver. 26, 27, “ At that day ye shall ask in my name ; and *I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you ;* for the Father himself loveth you.”

If Jesus had constantly and plainly told his disciples that he was Jehovah, the great God of heaven and earth, they would not have believed him, because he had all the appearance of being a man like themselves. He therefore usually called himself the *Son of God*, and thus gradually insinuated into their minds an idea of the divinity of his Humanity ; which idea, however, was not so clear as to be without all doubt ; for, as before observed, they were not prepared for so full and open a revelation. Hence it was, that the Lord, who best knows the times and seasons, because he alone knows the states of all hearts, almost immediately after the words already quoted by you, adds, “ These things have I spoken unto you *in proverbs* : the time cometh when I shall *no more speak unto you in proverbs*, but I shall *shew you plainly of the Father*,” John xvi. 25.

Now here I would beg leave to ask you what the Lord meant by speaking in this manner, if he had not some grand truth in reserve respecting the Father, which was improper to be fully communicated at that time, and which

men would not have believed, had it been plainly avowed? Surely he could not allude to the doctrine maintained by you, that God the Father was a great *unknown Being* distinct from himself: for there were enough at that time of day who already believed in this manner. There could be no reason for speaking to the disciples on that subject *in parables*, if all the while he meant no more than what was generally believed by the scribes and pharisees his persecutors, as well as by the bulk of the Jewish nation. He must therefore have alluded to such a doctrine concerning the Father and the Son, as was not then understood, but which was to be made known at a future day, by a further and plainer revelation. Now we know not of any *plainer revelation* having taken place concerning the Father than the words spoken by the Lord to his disciples, until the writings of Baron Swedenborg appeared in the world; and these do contain a manifest and plain revelation from the Lord himself, that *He and the Father are One Divine Person*, just as the soul and body are one man. Thus his own words are now for the first time verified in his New Church, in that *he hath shewn us plainly of the Father*; which evident accomplishment of Scripture, is, among many others, one striking proof of the divine commission of Baron Swedenborg.

* * *

But you object, p. 22, against Jesus being the same with the Father, because, “speaking of the day of judgment, he says, Mark xiii. 32, that the time of it was not known either to the angels or to himself, but *to the Father only*. If the Son was the same with the Father, surely every thing that was known to the one, must have been known to the other also; especially as you suppose there was no principle of intelligence in Christ besides that of the Father, he having no human soul.”

This is a very natural objection, and requires a particular answer. I shall therefore, according to my little measure of ability, endeavour to remove the veil that hangs over this grand mystery, by a disclosure of the true source of intelligence, and the laws of its descent from heaven to earth, from God to man. Afterwards I will apply the whole reasoning to illustrate the circumstance of the Lord's speaking of the Father as if he were a person different from himself, and the appearance of his having within him two distinct principles of intelligence, although in reality he had but one, which was his own divine wisdom. To do this effectually, would indeed require a volume of itself; but as I have not leisure for such an ample disquisition of the subject, I shall compress my ideas into as small a compass as possible.

First, then, it will be necessary to state, that in reality there is *only one principle of intelligence in the universe*, which is God. Every other principle of intelligence is only *apparently* such. Nevertheless such appearances are agreeable to the laws of divine order instituted at the creation, which require that every man should *seem to himself and others*, to think, will, and act, *of himself*. Without such an appearance he could not exist one single moment as a rational man, because there would be nothing in him that could *appropriate* the life flowing from God. Hence it is said in Gen. i. 26, 27, that God created man in *his own image*, after *his own likeness*: that is, he made him in all respects to have the *appearance* of being a God, to have the *appearance* of thinking, willing, and acting of himself, and consequently to have the *appearance* of a principle of intelligence within him distinct from God. Now as this was not a *real, genuine* truth, but only an *apparent* one, it is evident, that the *confirmation* of that appearance must have been highly criminal, because it

amounted to a denial and rejection of the real truth, viz. that *God only* has life, love, and wisdom in himself. This was the origin of evil.

From these premises I infer, that all intelligence, whether in angels or men, comes from, and belongs to, God alone ; that in order to be communicated to, and sensibly perceived by others, there must of necessity be in them forms or vessels receptive thereof ; and that in its descent from God it is varied, or at least appears to be varied, according to the recipient forms into which it flows.

Man is born in utter ignorance, destitute of all thought and ideas, there being nothing connate in him, but the *faculty* of science, intelligence, and wisdom, together with an inclination to love not only such things, but also himself, his neighbour, and God. This being the constitution of man at his birth, he is utterly incapable of forming an idea, without the aid of his external senses, which are the inlets of all impressions from without, and the means whereby his internal connate *faculties* may come into actual exercise. These faculties in man may be called the *first principles* of his thought and affection, which cannot properly be said to *exist*, until they have a body wherein to exist, and this body is formed by scientifics from the senses, and by instruction. Hence no one can think a thought, or have any idea, without impressions from external objects which may serve as a body for his thought to dwell in ; just as there can be no *sight*, which is something spiritual, without an *eye*, which is something natural.

But it ought to be well observed, that although impressions from external objects are made on us through the senses, yet they do not penetrate to the rational principle which resides in the internal, but stop in the natural principle, where they are met by the intellectual faculty, and assumed merely as its instruments of use. Thus the light

of the sun flows into the eye, but not into the internal mind ; yet the understanding meets that natural light, and being as it were cloathed with it, is thereby enabled to see the objects of the natural world, which it could not otherwise do. For what is natural or material cannot flow into what is spiritual, nor material ideas into immaterial or intellectual ideas ; science cannot flow into reason, nor speech into thought ; neither can the external flow into the internal ; for this would be like the crasser flowing into the purer, the posterior into the prior, and the effect into the cause, which are all impossibilities. It appears indeed, in a thousand instances, as if that was the true order of influx, but it is a mere fallacy of the senses. All influx, on the contrary, is from the spiritual into the natural world, consequently all intelligence is so likewise : but the nearer it is to the external or sensual principle, and the fewer and more imperfect the vessels or sciences which any man has to contain it, so much the more obscure and faint is his intelligence. Hence the new-born infant, having no science or experience as a vessel for the actual reception of reason, has of course neither reason nor intelligence, but only the faculty or capacity of acquiring vessels for a future reception. As he grows up, he accumulates science by the use of his senses, and from the instructions of his teachers, every day furnishing him with an additional stock of knowledges, into which, as into their proper vessels, reason, intelligence, and wisdom, continually flow from the spiritual world. But all this while the principle of intelligence is the same in its origin ; it only waits for the formation of a vessel to flow into ; till that is effected, it cannot make its appearance, nor even be perceived by man ; but as scientifics are provided by him from the external things of the natural world, light from heaven gradually flows into them, and the man becomes more and more intelligent and wise.

Such then is the law of the descent of intellectual light from God into the minds of men.

Having made these remarks on the nature of influx in general, and on the progress of man from mere ignorance to a state of wisdom and intelligence, I shall now apply the substance of what has been said to the case of the Lord, with a view to illustrate, in some small degree, the process of his glorification, and thereby satisfactorily to account for his speaking of the Father as of a person that knew all things, but of the Son as of one who was ignorant of the day of the last judgment, while at the same time he himself was both that Father and that Son.

God from eternity was a man in *first principles*, but not actually such *in the ultimates** till the incarnation. He often declared by the prophets, that he himself would descend into the world, assume human nature, be born as a child, and during his abode in the world be called the Messiah, the Son of God, Immanuel, Redeemer, &c. At the appointed time he came; a virgin conceived without the aid of man; Divine Truth itself, such as is contained in the Word, impregnated her; and a God-man was born; at which all the hosts of heaven rejoiced. This divine child was called Jesus Christ. In assuming this form, the pure Divinity descended from his high abode, first into the angelic heaven, from thence into the womb of Mary in the natural world, where he cloathed himself with material substances from her body; and at last was born as any other child. Thus the divine principle of intelligence became as it were *obscure*, in consequence of being surrounded with such gross substances from Mary, as were not capable of receiving the full influx of divine life from within.

* Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews, chap. vii. 9, 10, says of Levi, that "he paid tithes in Abraham; for he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him." This is as much as saying, that Levi was a man in *first principles*, long before he was actually a man *in the ultimates*.

Therefore, agreeably to the established laws of influx, as before mentioned, the divinity could not fully manifest itself in the infant form, until by instructions, and scientifics derived from the natural world, proper vessels were formed to receive it. Hence it is written, that “Jesus *increased in wisdom* and stature, and in favour with God and man,” Luke ii. 52. As the same false appearances of things presented themselves to him, as do to every other man, these furnished him with occasions for meditating upon them, and detecting their fallacy ; which he was always enabled to do, by appealing to that divine principle he was conscious resided within him. While he was in the act of appealing or praying to the Father within him, it would indeed appear as if the principle of intelligence in the Son was distinct from that of the Father ; but they were in reality no more distinct in Jesus, than in David when he called upon his soul, and all that was within him, to praise the Lord.

For further illustration, we will consider the Lord, as having three degrees of perception of truth ; a first or internal, called *intellectual* ; a second or middle, called *rational* ; and a third or lowest, called *scientific*. When he thought from the latter, he was ignorant of many things, and therefore needed *instruction* : when from the rational, he was in the clear perception of truth, as the Son of God, yet by assistance from a superior principle called his Father : but when he thought from the intellectual, (if that can be called *thought*, which is essential and perfect wisdom and love united) he spake as Jehovah the Father himself, who knew all things, even the hour of the last judgment. From the shade of the *scientific* man, he advanced to the light of the *rational* man, and from this to the full perception of the divine *intellectual* man. During the whole process of his glorification, he continually re-

moved the imperfections and infirmities necessarily attendant on the gross human nature, till at last he completely united in himself the infinite perfections of divinity with the ultimate form of humanity. Thus he that was God, became perfect Man; and he that was Man, became perfect God.

Now let us see what use can be made of the foregoing observations, in illustrating the passage of Scripture alluded to in Mark xiii. 32, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Here you say, Jesus evidently distinguishes between himself and the omniscient God, attributing to the Father what he denies to himself. Not so; Jesus, in this passage, no more distinguishes between himself and the Father, than he does between himself and the Son; and for all that is expressed to the contrary, he might as well have alluded to himself as being the Father to whom the time *was* known, as to himself as being the Son to whom it was *not* known. If merely his speaking *of the Father* be a sufficient proof that he was *not* that Father, then his speaking *of the Son* is to the full as good a proof that he was *not* that Son. To say that he meant *himself* by the term *Son*, and *another* distinct from himself by the term *Father*, is a mere *petitio principii*, a begging of the question. He speaks of the Father, I will admit, *apparently* as of a third person; but he also speaks *in like manner* of the Son. Therefore according this view of the subject, the whole of the objection has lost its weight, and falls to the ground; for although it is true, that the Lord in other places frequently calls himself the *Son* of God, yet it is equally true that he is sometimes declared to be the *Father*, and the *very God*.

But not to take this advantage of the weakness of the objection, I will for argument's sake, (or rather for the sake

of manifesting the truth,) allow it all the importance, which you seem to think it carries with it. How easy is it to see, from the preceding remarks on the various discrete degrees of intelligence in one mind, that the Lord meant to instruct us, that *truth* not yet fully united to divine *good* (signified by the *Son* as distinguished from the *Father*) was not possessed of that infinitely-complete perception of all things, which it would have when the perfect union was accomplished ; or, in other words, that himself, in the capacity of *Son*, could not manifestly exhibit those full perfections of divinity, which the laws of order required him to exercise as *Father*. That Jesus is the Father, as well as the Son, is also plain from this circumstance, that he is the *sole judge* of the living and the dead, for into his hands all judgment is committed. Now as no one can be a *competent* judge of every creature in the universe, who is so defective in capacity as *not to know* even the time *when to commence it* ; and as the sitting in judgment over the thoughts, intentions, and motives of all hearts, as well as over their every word and action, implies to the full as much an infinite capacity, if not more so than the mere knowledge of the day when such an event is to take place ; I infer, that he who knows the greater, cannot be ignorant of the less ; that he, who is equal to the one, is sufficient for the other also ; consequently that Jesus being qualified to *execute* judgment, must know the proper time *when* to do it ; and that therefore he himself was that very Father to whom he alluded, as alone knowing the day and hour of that great event.

There is one circumstance highly necessary to be observed in reading the Holy Scriptures, if we would attain to a right understanding of their contents ; without a due attention to which, many passages will unavoidably appear dark, perplexed, and contradictory to others. What I

allude to, is, the frequent use of *apparent* truths in the literal sense, instead of those that are *genuine*, together with the necessity of an inversion of the terms, in order to obtain the spiritual sense. My meaning will be best explained by an example. It is frequently said in the Word, that God is angry, that he punishes, casts into hell, and destroys the wicked. These are only *apparent* truths, not *real* or *genuine*; for the Lord is love itself, and mercy itself, and it is not within the power of love and mercy to punish, or bring evil upon any one. To come at the genuine truth, then, there must be an inversion or change of terms, at least in our idea. Thus, instead of supposing that the Lord is *angry* and *casts into hell*, we must understand that he is *merciful* and *does good*, and that it is man who is angry with the Lord, and casts himself into hell; for such is the genuine truth, as is particularly evident in Psalm cxxxvi. 10, 15 to 20, where the destruction of the Egyptians, &c. is attributed to his everlasting mercy. The Lord, in his own person, when on earth, represented not only the Word itself, but also the state of the church on earth; so that what is spoken of the Lord, will in many cases admit of being applied to man. Take an example: "Jesus charged his disciples, that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ," Matt. xvi. 20. Here it is said of Jesus, that he charged his disciples not to publish him abroad, although he came into the world and chose his disciples for that very purpose. This passage, therefore, appears to be one that is more immediately applicable to the state of the church, and descriptive of its non-reception of truth, than to the Lord, who certainly willed that all men should receive and acknowledge him. In another place it is said, that *he could do no mighty work there, because of their unbelief*, Mark vi. 5, 6; where *non-ability* is ascribed to the Lord, on account of *unbelief* in the people. From

these and other passages of a similar nature, it is very evident, that many things spoken of Jesus have a *relative* application to the state of the church at that time, and ought to be interpreted accordingly.

Agreeably to these observations, the circumstance of the day and hour of the last judgment being hid from the Son, and known only to the Father, will admit of the following explanation. The *Father* signifies the Lord as to divine good, and in respect to the church the reception thereof under the description of charity. The *Son* signifies the Lord as to divine truth, and in respect to the church the reception thereof under the form of faith. Now the end of the church, signified by the last judgment, being principally in consequence of the destruction of charity, which has immediate reference to divine good or to the Lord as Father, it is therefore said, that the Father only knoweth the time, and not the Son; by which is signified, that the last state of the church is determined by the defection of charity, and not so much by the want of faith; for immediately on the expiration of charity, the church ceases to be any longer a church, notwithstanding all its faith. As long as charity remains, the church remains, but as soon as ever that is lost, the judgment takes place. To make the case, if possible, still plainer, the following additional explanation is submitted to the attentive consideration of the reader. The Lord is distinguished in the Gospels by various names: among others he is sometimes called the *Son of God*, sometimes the *Son of Man*, and at other times simply the *Son*, which latter expression may be referred to either of the two former, according to the nature of the subject treated of. In general, by the *Son of God* is meant the Lord as to his *divine person*; but by the *Son of Man*, the Lord as to the *Word*, or as to the *divine truth* contained in the Word. And further by the Son of

Man *before glorification* is denoted the Word as to its *literal sense*, or such as we have it on earth ; but by the Son of Man *when glorified*, the Word in its *spiritual sense*, or such as angels have it in heaven. Now when it is said in reference to the last judgment, &c. that “ of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,” we are instructed by the Lord, that the *precise state* of the church, such as it would be at its end or consummation, is neither revealed to *men*, nor to *angels*, because it is not particularly described in the *Word* either in its *literal* or in its *spiritual sense*. For what is *not contained* or *not described* in the Word, and thus as it were *not present* with the Word, may properly be said *not to be known* by the *Word*, or by the *Son*, who (as already observed) is the divine truth of the Word : in like manner as the workers of iniquity, and the foolish virgins, who were *not spiritually present* with the Lord, that is, *not in conjunction* with him, are said *not to be known by the Lord*,” Matt. vii. 23 ; chap. xxv. 12 : or again, in like manner as it is written even of the OMNISCIENT JEHOVAH himself, that the wickedness of the Israelites was so great, that he had *no previous* idea of its ever coming to such a pitch, as he *afterwards found* it did. For, says he, “ They built the high places of Baal, which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Moloch, which I commanded them not, *neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination to cause Judah to sin*,” Jer. xxxii. 35. And yet every event, every state of good and evil, and every individual, whether in or out of the church, must be perfectly known by him, who is no less than the *God of the Word, of the church, and of the universe*, that is, the *Omniscient* as well as the *Omni-potent Father of all*.

Moreover it is to be observed, that, as by the *Son* is meant the divine truth *proceeding from* the Lord, which is the same thing as the divine truth *accommodated to the apprehension of the creature*; and as it is impossible that any *finite being* can acquire a *distinct and perfect knowledge* of all the interior states of life appertaining to so many millions and millions of souls, as constitute the vast assemblage of those who were to be judged either to heaven or to hell, therefore, to point out this inherent *incapacity*, both in men and in angels, to search and try the human heart, and thus to sit in judgment on mankind, it is written, that *not even the Son himself* is acquainted with the day and hour of that great event, but *the Father only*: by which is signified, that such knowledge and wisdom form no part of that divine truth which is *communicated* or *accommodated to* the creature, and consequently no part of that divine truth which is said to *proceed from* the Lord, and which on that account is called the *Son*: for by each of these expressions, whether it be the *Son*, or the divine truth *proceeding from* the Lord, or the divine truth *communicated* and *accommodated* to the creature, still, as before stated, one and the same thing is understood. And thus we find, after due investigation of the subject, that the passage in question makes nothing in favour either of the Unitarian or the Trinitarian doctrine, but on the contrary exalts him, who is qualified to be the judge both of the living and the dead, infinitely above all that can possibly be apprehended by finite minds, because it makes him in his highest capacity to be the OMNISCIENT FATHER himself.

* * *

In Matt. xxviii. 18, Jesus says to his disciples, "*All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.*" And in Luke x. 22, "*All things are delivered to me of my Father.*" You

quote these two passages, in p. 22, as a proof of the distinction between the Father who *gave* the power, and Jesus who *received* it; and then immediately you put the following question, “Can the *giver* and *receiver* be the same person, any more than the person *sending*, and the person *sent*?” I have already shewn, that the person *sending* and the person *sent* may be one and the same; I will now prove, from the authority of Scripture, that the *giver* and *receiver*, in the following instances, not only *may be* one and the same person, but clearly and absolutely *can be no other*.

Jehovah says by the prophet Isaiah, “I am Jehovah, that is my name, and *my glory will I not give to another*,” Isa. xlii. 8. The glory of Jehovah consists in his being possessed of all divine and infinite perfections, of which *omnipotence* is one. Jehovah the Father gave to Jesus *all power*, as is expressly declared; therefore unless Jesus were the same person as the Father, Jehovah gave his glory of omnipotence to *another*. But as this cannot possibly be true, I conclude that Jesus and Jehovah are one and the same person, consequently that the *giver* and *receiver* are one and the same also.

When Jesus would instruct his disciples of the union subsisting between himself and the Father, that it was like the union subsisting between the soul and body of one man, he did it in such terms as these: “As the Father hath *life in himself*, so hath he *given* to the Son to have *life in himself*,” John v. 26. Now he that hath *life in himself*, must be essentially God: and as it is impossible for God to communicate to *another* being the essentially divine property of having *life in himself*, for this would be *one God creating another God*, which is a manifest absurdity; and as it is said that the Father *gave* to the Son (meaning to Jesus Christ) that divine property of having life in him-

self in all respects as God the Father had ; it is evident, that the Father and the Son can be no other than one and the same God, consequently that the *giver* and *receiver* are one and the same person.

It is said of the Lord God Almighty, that *he has taken to himself* his great power, Apoc. xi. 17. Now although it may seem, according to the literal sense of these words, that there was a time when the Lord God Almighty had not that great power which he now has, but that it was lodged in some *other hands* ; just as, when it is said of Jesus, that *all power is given unto him*, it may appear as if he received it from *another*, there being no greater impropriety in the one case, than in the other ; yet no one will pretend to build an argument on such ground against the real divinity of the Lord God Almighty. Why then, Dr. Priestley, do you make that an argument against the sole and supreme divinity of Jesus Christ, which equally and as strongly operates against the great Jehovah himself ?

Jesus not only hath *all power* in heaven and in earth, but *every other* attribute of divinity that can possibly be conceived. Infinity, immensity, and eternity are his. He is self-essent and self-existent ; the I Am, Independent, Sole, Supreme, from eternity the First, and to eternity the Last ; for, says he, “ *All things that the Father hath are mine,*” John xvi. 15. No divine attribute then can be wanting in him. The *fulness* of the Godhead must necessarily dwell in him, not as a power or principle distinct from him, but as *one with him*, like the *soul and body* in man. Were we to suppose it *possible* for the Father to be a God distinct from Jesus Christ, then, agreeably to the above passage in Matthew, he must have resigned his kingdom and power to Jesus Christ, and consequently is no longer the God of heaven and earth. But Jehovah will not, cannot give either his glory or omnipotence to *another*.

He may and hath given it to *himself*; that is, the Divinity of Jehovah hath given it to the Humanity of the same Jehovah; for Jesus, who is God in the Humanity, and who received all power from the Father, says, “*I and my Father are one*,” John x. 30; one, not by unanimity, but absolutely and inseparably, being as incapable of division without a complete and total denial of the whole God-head, as the soul and body of man are, without death.

* * *

The next thing I have to remark upon, is the conclusion you draw from the following passage in John, “This is life eternal, that they might know *thee the only true God*, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,” chap xvii. 3. What has already been advanced concerning the *apparent* distinction between the person of the Father and that of the Son, may be equally applied to this and many other passages in the Word. Permit me, however, to bring to your recollection the testimony of John in respect to Jesus Christ the Son of God. He says, 1 Epist. v. 20, “*This* is the true God*, and eternal life.” Now you know there cannot be *two* true Gods. Jesus calls his *Father* the true God, and John calls *Jesus* the true God. If both propositions be admitted, then no conclusion can be more regular or certain, than that *the Father and Jesus are one and the same God*. The apostle Jude likewise agrees with us of the New Church in ascribing “glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever, to the *only wise God our Saviour*,” verse 25.

Our Lord says, that *life eternal* consists in knowing the *Father and Jesus Christ*. This appears to me exceedingly unfavourable to the Socinian scheme; for if Jesus

* It will avail nothing to say, that the definitive pronoun *this* refers not to Jesus Christ, but to the Father; the plain sense of the words being evidently such as they are here taken, viz. that Jesus Christ is the true God and eternal life.

Christ be no more than a *mere man*, I cannot see how the knowledge of him, any more than of any other prophet, can be one of the essential conditions and constituents of life eternal. To know the *true God*, one might naturally expect to be necessary to salvation; but that the knowledge of a *mere man*, be he who he may, should be to the full *as necessary* and *as essential* to our future happiness, as the knowledge of the *only true God*, is a supposition which, I think, even a Mahometan or a Pagan would blush to maintain. And is this the *scheme of Christianity* which Dr. Priestley invites the members of the New Jerusalem to embrace!—My good Friend, let me intreat you to reconsider this matter, and seriously weigh in your mind the consequences of such a delusion. If Jesus be no more than a prophet, like Moses, or Jonah, or Amos, or any others, what virtue can there be in the knowledge of him, any more than of them? But if he be the *Divine Human Form* of God, then the acknowledgment of him must be *as essential* to salvation, as the acknowledgment of the *Father*, seeing that both the *Father* and the *Son*, the *essence* and the *form*, together constitute only *one God*.

In John iii. 16, and other places, Jesus calls himself the *only-begotten* Son of God: but in what sense this is to be understood, deserves some consideration. If Jesus were a mere man, it would not be saying the truth to call him the *only-begotten* Son of God, seeing that all men, who are born again, are equally said to be begotten of God, and even called the sons of God. The expression, however, of *only-begotten* is repeatedly applied to Jesus Christ, which is therefore evidently repugnant to the supposition of his being a mere man. But if we consider Jesus Christ as the *Humanity* of Jehovah, then it is with great propriety said of him, that he is the *only-begotten of the Father*; for the divine *essence*, which is meant by the Father, being

individual, has begotten to itself a divine *form*, which is also individual; and thus Divinity and Humanity are united in one God, as soul and body are united in one man, which union is signified by the only-begotten Son dwelling in the bosom of the Father.

It is on account of this strict union between the Father and the Son, that it is said, "He that honoureth not *the Son*, honoureth not the Father," John v. 23. "He that believeth on *the Son*, hath everlasting life," John iii. 36. "This is the will of the Father, that every one who seeth *the Son*, and believeth on *him*, may have everlasting life," John vi. 40. "Whoso denieth *the Son*, the same hath not the Father," 1 John ii. 23. "God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is *in his Son*. He that hath *the Son*, hath life; but he that hath not *the Son*, hath not life," 1 John v. 11, 12. From all these passages the following plain conclusion naturally results, viz. That the Son is the *continent* of the Father, just as light is the *continent* of heat, as the form is the *continent* of the essence, or as the body is the *continent* of the soul; and he that sees the one, sees all that can be seen of the other. If I wish to converse with a man's *soul*, I must approach his *body*; for there the soul is, and no where else. And while I address the body, I at the same time address the whole man, both soul and body together. But were I to attempt to address the soul separately or distinct from the body, it would not only be absurd in itself, but could not possibly be attended with any effect; for if the *fulness of the soul*, or the *whole soul*, resides *in* the body, and not *out of it*, to the body alone must the *direct* and *immediate* approach be made. On this very principle it is, that the members of the New Jerusalem approach Jesus Christ alone, as knowing that the *fulness of the Godhead*, or the *whole Divinity*, centers in his Humanity, and is no where else to

be found. Thus by approaching him, they at the same time approach the Father, because the Father is in him, as the soul is in the body. Were we to attempt to “climb up any other way,” by addressing the Divinity separate from the Humanity, we believe we should be “*thieves and robbers*,” inasmuch as such conduct would be no less than robbing the Lord’s Humanity of all its Divinity. See John x. 1.

* * *

Another stumbling-block, which seems to lie in your way, is the passage in John xx. 17, “I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.” “Here surely,” you say, p. 22 “are two different persons indicated. Can any person be said to ascend to himself?”—I answer in the affirmative. If you will not believe me, hear what Paul says: “Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; *God* was manifest in the flesh, *God* was justified in the spirit, *God* was seen of angels, *God* was preached unto the gentiles, *God* was believed on in the world, *God* was *received up* into glory,” 1 Tim. iii. 16. *God* was received up into glory! Who received him there? Doubtless *God* *received himself* there. *Jesus*, I know, was manifest in the flesh, *Jesus* was justified in the spirit, *Jesus* was seen of angels, *Jesus* was preached unto the gentiles, *Jesus* was believed on in the world, and *Jesus* was received up into glory. Therefore *Jesus* was *God*, and ascended up to himself.

Again, David says, “*God is gone up with a shout*,” Psalm xlvii. 5. Where, I pray you, could *He* go to, who is *omnipresent*, if not up to himself? Parallel with this is the passage in John xx. 17, where *Jesus* says, “*I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God*.” In the first passage, *God goes up*; in the second, *Jesus ascends*. Now as *God* cannot go any where, but where he was before by virtue of his *omnipresence*, it must

be understood that *God went up to God*, that is, *to himself*. And as in verse 28 of the same chapter of John, Jesus is called *God* in express terms, I therefore conclude, and I trust without any violence to truth, that the meaning of the second passage is, that *Jesus ascended to himself*, or which is the same thing, though in other words, that *God went up to God*.

As I have already explained, according to my view of the subject, the internal sense of John xx. 17, respecting the Lord's ascension into heaven, and published it in the *Magazine of Knowledge concerning Heaven and Hell*, vol. i. p. 273, to 277, there is no necessity for inserting it here; neither do I conceive it would be of much use to those who deny the reality of such a sense, as I am sorry to observe is the case with the gentleman, to whom these *Letters* are more immediately addressed. I shall therefore proceed to the examination of other objections.

* * *

At the foot of p. 22, you say, "Lastly, our Saviour says, John xiv. 28, that *his Father was greater than he*. Can any person be greater than himself?" There are some cases, in which a man may be greater than himself; and of this you yourself seem to be apprized, for you continue, "The same person may no doubt, be greater at one time than he was at another; but here he speaks of the same time. Also, a man in one capacity may be greater than he is in another; as a general at the head of his army may be said to be greater than he is at his fire-side. But here our Saviour speaks *absolutely*." Rather say, he speaks *relatively*; for so the truth is. He was telling his disciples, that he was *about to ascend to the Father*; which was as much as to say, that his Humanity was *not yet perfectly united* to his Divinity; and *until* this was the case, and *by how much* it was *not* united, just so far he was inferior to the

Father; but *by how much* it was united, so far he was equal to, and one with the Father. Hence we find him speaking in two ways; at one time having respect to the Humanity *as not yet glorified*, in which state he speaks of the Father as *greater than himself*; and at another time having respect to the Humanity *as glorified*, in which state he says, "*I and my Father are one.*"

Before a man's passions are properly subdued, and when he is tempted to commit a rash action, if he is a wise man, or in pursuit of wisdom, he will *look up* to his reason and understanding for assistance, hereby virtually acknowledging that his reason is greater than himself. In this situation of mind he may with great propriety say, '*Of myself* I cannot resist these temptations, being as it were immersed in all kinds of vicious inclinations, which have their abode in the lowest regions of the mind: I will therefore ascend into its superior regions, and elevate myself into the light of reason, for *my reason is greater than my passion.*' Now here, notwithstanding the man's reason is greater than his passion, and thus the man himself greater in one respect than he is in another respect, still both his reason and passion constitute but one person. It was just so, comparatively speaking, with the Lord: his Father was the Divinity within him; himself was the Humanity. While the Humanity was subject to temptations the Father was greater than he, because the Divinity could not be tempted. But when the Humanity was fully united to the Divinity, then neither could the Humanity be tempted, any more than the Divinity, because all the properties of the latter centered bodily in the former. Hence the Lord says, "*I and my Father are one.*" There is therefore no difficulty at all in comprehending how and in what respect the Father was greater than Jesus; and yet after all, that both he and the Father were one and the same divine person.

* * *

The explanation you give, p. 23, of our Lord's words in John x. 29, is to me very extraordinary and unnatural, implying consequences not only irrational and absurd, but even blasphemous, utterly destructive of the universe, and together with it the Creator of the universe himself. I cannot indeed think you were aware of any such inferences being deducible from your doctrine ; but I see they necessarily result from the Socinian method of interpreting the Scripture. Our Lord's words are as follow : " My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And *I give* unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of *my hand*. My Father who gave them me, is greater than all ; and none is able to pluck them out of *my Father's hand*. I and my Father are one," John x. 27 to 30. *I and my Father are one*, " that is," you say, " no person can overpower *me*, but he must overpower *the Father also*." Here let us pause a moment to consider the consequences of such an interpretation as this, according to the Socinian faith. You, Sir, as a Socinian, maintain that Jesus Christ was a *mere man*, both as to his soul and his body ; that in consequence of this mere humanity, he was, like any other man, liable to sufferings and death ; and that the Jews, whose prejudices he opposed, at last actually crucified him, or, agreeably to your own expression, *overpowered him*. Now if, as you say, the meaning of the Lord's words above recited is, that " no one can overpower him, but he must overpower the Father also," it will then follow, that the Jews, by crucifying the *mere man Jesus*, at the same time actually *overpowered the supreme God* ! Such is the unavoidable consequence of interpreting the Lord's words in the way you have done.

But if we pursue your notions a little further, we shall see something, if possible, still more absurd. You believe,

that when a man dies as to the body, all consciousness of life or existence perishes with him ; thus that both soul and body together lie dead in the grave. Now, if the Father was overpowered at the same time that Jesus was overpowered, when he was crucified and buried, then the Father must have been in a state of torpor and death, as well as Jesus : I would therefore beg leave to ask, By what power was it that Jesus was raised from the grave ? He could not raise himself, because you say he was a mere man ; and besides, he had been so *overpowered* by the Jews, that all his own powers were become extinct. Neither could the Father raise him, because *his* powers were also extinct, in consequence of the Jews overpowering Jesus ; for “ *no person,*” you say, “ *can overpower Jesus, but he must overpower the Father also.*” Again, if, as you say, p. 50, that God has no other form or shape, than that of *infinite space*, it will follow, that when Jesus was overpowered, *infinite space* also was overpowered ; since whatever misfortune befalls the *essence* of any being, must likewise necessarily happen to his *form*. Hence it is plain to see, that the method of interpreting the Scriptures, which Socinians are obliged to have recourse to, is the most irrational, absurd, and self-contradictory, that can possibly be imagined ; nay, that it even militates against the very being of a God, against the existence of a heaven and a hell, or a life after death, and against every thing spiritual or divine ; instead of God, setting up nature, or, what amounts to the same thing, *infinite space*, as the object of worship, of which nevertheless no proper idea can be formed in the human mind.

After having made these remarks on your mode of interpreting our Lord’s words, I will now point out what appears to me to be a much more rational and consistent explanation. Jesus says, “ *My sheep hear my voice, and follow*

me. And *I* give unto them eternal life, neither shall any pluck them out of *my hand*. My Father who *gave them me*, is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my *Father's hand*. I and my Father *are one*." Here it is plain, the sheep *belong to Jesus*, and *he gives* them eternal life. He indeed says, that no one can pluck them out of his *Father's hand*; but he also says, None shall pluck them out of *my hand*. Wherefore the Father's hand, and the hand of Jesus, must be one and the same; for the sheep cannot be in *two different persons'* hands at the same time. If the Father be a different person from Jesus, then the sheep are not in the Father's hand at all; for he gave them away *out of his own hand* into the hand of Jesus. But as the passage plainly implies, that, notwithstanding the Father's giving them away *into the hand of Jesus*, they still remained *in his own hand* likewise; no other conclusion can be fairly drawn, than that Jesus and the Father are one and the same person. And this is the conclusion that our Lord himself has drawn; for immediately after making the *apparent* distinction between himself and the Father, he teaches us how to understand him, and in express terms says, "I and my Father *are One*."

It is therefore impossible to reconcile our Lord's words concerning the Father and himself, in any other way, than by considering the Father to be the Divinity, and Jesus the Humanity, of one and the same God. For as in the case of an individual man, the soul *gives* or *transfers* all its power to the body, and yet at the same time *retains* it to itself; so the Divinity *gives* or *transfers* all its power to the Humanity, and yet at the same time *retains* it to itself; or in other words, the Father *gives* all his power to the Son Jesus, and yet *retains* it to himself; for after all they are only one and the same divine person.

You say, p. 23, that the *constant* language which the apostles used, when they spake of our Saviour and God, “demonstrates, that they considered *him* as being a person different from God.” I allow, that the greatest part of their writings wears this aspect; and I have already hinted the reason why it could not be otherwise, viz. because it is agreeable to order, that divine truth, like every thing else, should be gradual in its manifestation. The light of the natural day does not come on instantaneously; first of all the twilight, then the day-dawn, and last of all the direct beams of the sun. It is the same with every art and science hitherto discovered; the same with the growth of man, both as to his intellectual and animal powers; the same with the production of plants and trees from small seeds till they arrive at their full maturity, and are capable of bearing fruit; in short, it is the same with every thing in nature that surrounds us. Why then should the light of revelation alone be deemed sudden or instantaneous? Is not the understanding (which is the eye of the mind) as susceptible of injury from the *too precipitate* influx of divine truth into it, as the eye of the body is from that of natural light? Most certainly it is. For this reason our Lord said to his disciples, “I have yet many things to say unto you, *but ye cannot bear them now,*” John xvi. 12. Hence also he spake to them mostly in parables, at the same time informing them, that a day was coming when the parables, which he then uttered, would be clearly unfolded, and when by his Holy Spirit (a new spiritual revelation) he would speak more plainly to his Church, than it was as yet capable of bearing.

But although the apostles were not so clear concerning the union of the Father and Son in one person, yet it is remarkable, that many passages are to be found in their writings to confirm this grand truth. Such are the following

among many others. “Hereby perceive we the love of *God*, because *he laid down his life for us*,” 1 John iii. 16. Jesus Christ alone laid down his life for us: therefore Jesus Christ alone is God, and this according to the plain declaration of John.—“Jesus Christ is the *true God*, and eternal life,” 1 John v. 20. Jude says, that certain men “deny the *only* Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ,” verse 4. Paul says, there is “*one* Lord, *one* God and Father,” Eph. iv. 5, 6. Now Jesus Christ is constantly called the *Lord* by all the apostles: therefore the Lord Jesus and the only Lord God must be one and the same person; otherwise Paul was mistaken when he said there was only *one Lord*.—Again, “Jesus Christ the same *yesterday, to-day, and for ever*,” Heb. xiii. 8. This is a character applicable only to Jehovah that *changeth not*, Mal. iii. 6. “*In Jesus Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*,” Col. ii. 9. All the fulness of the Godhead cannot dwell in Jesus Christ in any other way, than as all the fulness of the soul dwells in the body: therefore God and Jesus Christ must be one and the same person, as the soul and body are one man. The same apostle further says of our Lord Jesus Christ, that “he is the blessed and *only Potentate*, the *King of kings*, and *Lord of lords*; *who only* hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom (as the Father) no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honour and power everlasting, Amen,” 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. I might fill many pages with passages of a similar tendency, all selected from the apostolic epistles; but the above are sufficient to establish the sole, exclusive divinity of Jesus, and to disprove your assertions in p. 23 and 24, that “the apostles *constantly* spake of him as a person different from God;” for they *very often* speak of him in such terms, as can have no other meaning than that he is the sole God.

* * *

“I have considered (you say, p. 24,) all that you alledge,” in favour of Jesus Christ being the same person as God the Father, “and find them only to be a *few passages* which literally interpreted, *might indeed imply as much*, but which very easily admit of a very different interpretation; and in all cases we interpret what is *figurative* and *obscure*, by what is *clear* and *express*.” By your saying we have only a *few passages* by which to support the exclusive divinity of Jesus Christ, I am convinced you have not informed yourself sufficiently of the evidence which Baron Swedenborg adduces from the Scriptures, in proof of this matter. And if you have not paid a proper attention to the evidence, it is impossible you could have digested the subject, or formed a right judgment about it. The passages of Scripture, on which the exclusive divinity of our Saviour is founded, are exceedingly numerous; and, when viewed in their true light, afford the most satisfactory proof, that God the Father and Jesus Christ are one and the same person. Many of these passages are adduced in the present *Defence*; but many more might be pointed out in aid of the same doctrine, were it necessary. Let what has been said, and what still remains to be said on the same subject, answer in this behalf.

You admit that what is figurative and obscure ought to be interpreted by what is clear and express: but it is remarkable you will allow nothing to be clear and express, except such passages as *appear* in the literal sense to favour your own sentiments. Those which *you* say are *obscure*, are to *others* *clear* and *explicit*; while those which you take to be *genuine truths*, are evidently no more than the *appearances of truth*, the confirmation of which is like grasping at the shadow, and losing the substance. So long therefore as you continue to view the Scriptures from

a *negative* principle, I fear it will be impossible for you to see your mistake. By a *negative* principle I mean a *pre-conceived* denial and rejection of the divinity of Jesus Christ. My reasons for thinking that you are really influenced by such a principle, are grounded on the whole tenor of your theological writings, and particularly on the following passages in your *Letters to the Members of the New Jerusalem*. “Whatever particular passage may seem to intimate” that Christ and God are one person, “must have some other meaning; and even if we could not explain it otherwise, we ought to *content ourselves* with *acknowledging the difficulty*, or suppose *some error* to have *crept into the text*,” p. 25. “Should any being, in the complete form of an angel, tell me, that God had the form of a Man, and that this God was Jesus Christ, I should tell him that he was a *lying spirit*,” p. 60. Such is the language you hold out concerning our blessed Saviour, which for your sake, I was extremely sorry to read, because it carried so much the appearance of a *fixed, determined resolution not to be convinced*, by any argument whatever, of the divinity of Jesus Christ. And I well know, that where the *will* tyrannizes, the *understanding* must be a slave.

* . . * *

You seem, p. 25, to be aware of the great strength of our Lord’s words to Philip, and how completely they overthrow your whole system. “Philip saith unto him, Lord shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have *I* been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known *Me* Philip? He that hath seen *Me*, hath seen *the Father*,” John xiv. 8, 9. Of which passage you give the following explanation. “Jesus, you cannot deny, was used to speak in figurative language; and where is there a more common figure of speech than to say, *we see a person in his works*, and especially *in those persons* who are com-

missioned to say or do any thing in his name? We even say, that God, who is invisible, is to be seen in his *works*. Now the power and wisdom of God were manifest in Christ, who spake and acted by immediate commission from him; and seeing the manifestations of divine wisdom and power either in the works of nature, or in the sayings and miracles of the prophets, is all that we can see of God, who is himself invisible.”

This explanation of our Lord’s words appears to me to be a mere evasion, and in the end destroys itself. For, in the first place, you arbitrarily substitute the *works* of Jesus, instead of his *person*. When Philip said, *Shew us the Father*, our Lord directed him to *himself*, in his own *proper person*, and not to his *works*, as you endeavour to make your readers believe. Had it been the Lord’s design to answer Philip by a reference merely to the *works* of the Father, he would certainly have pointed him to the visible creation, or else to the sayings and miracles of the prophets, which, you say, *is all that we can see of God*. But instead of this, he told Philip, that the sight of *him* was the same thing as seeing the *Father*, and that because the Father dwelt in him as the soul does in the body. Afterwards, indeed, he desired Philip to believe him *for the very works’ sake*, verse 11; but then what was he to believe? Why, he was to believe the truth of what the Lord had just before told him, viz. “He that hath seen *Me*, hath seen the *Father*.” And if, by reason of his having the *appearance* of a mere man, Philip could not discern the divinity of his *person*, he was nevertheless enjoined to believe it *for the very works’ sake*.

But again: You believe, that Jesus was no more than a common man, like any of the prophets or apostles: and you say, that all we can see of God, is either in his works, or in those persons who are commissioned to say or do any

thing in his name. Upon this supposition, then, it will follow, that when Philip desired to see the Father, the Lord might with as much propriety have referred him to John the Baptist, or any other of the prophets, as to himself. Nay, to come closer still, and more evidently expose the fallacy of your principles, he might have said, "He that hath seen *Philip*, hath seen *the Father*; for Philip also (being an apostle) had the power of working miracles committed to him, and in this respect equally manifested the works of God, from whom, you say, as from a Being different from either of them, they derived all their power. But the absurdity of such an hypothesis as this, needs only to be brought to light, to be rejected by every rational Christian. And I doubt not but the judicious reader already agrees with me, that the explanation you have given of the foregoing passage, is forced, unnatural, and destructive of itself.

* * *

Another passage which you observe we quote in proof that Jesus and the Father are one and the same person, is that of Paul, Coloss. ii. 9. "*In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*" "But this," you say, p, 26, "might be the case without Jesus himself being God, when the divine power was manifested by him. Nay, the phraseology of this passage is unfavourable to your hypothesis, for that which dwells in a person cannot be the same thing with himself, but must be different from him."

I wonder, Sir, how you could run the risk of exposing yourself, by letting such unguarded expressions escape your pen. Have you forgotten, that the *soul* of every man *dwells* in his *body*? Or do you mean to say, that a man's soul is not the man himself, but something *different from him*? Are all your ideas of humanity confined to the mere corporeal frame? If so, you must be a *materialist* with a

witness, admitting nothing to enter into the constitution of man, but what you can see with your eyes, hear with your ears, smell with your nose, taste with your tongue, or touch with your hands. The apostle James says, “The *spirit* that *dwelleth in us*, lusteth to envy;” and he makes no distinction between the spirit of a man, that dwells in him, and the man himself. See chap. iv. 2, 5. Here the phraseology of James, respecting a man and his soul, agrees with that of Paul, concerning Jesus, that in him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead; and in both cases, by that which dwells in the person, is signified the same thing as the person himself.

I have already observed in a former part of this *Defence*, p. 93, that Jesus was possessed of *all power* in heaven and earth, with *every other attribute of divinity*, agreeably to his own words in John xvi. 15, “*All things that the Father hath, are mine.*” With this passage the saying of Paul perfectly coincides: therefore what has been advanced concerning the one, will equally apply to the other also. But as a proof that the *fulness of the Godhead* is the same thing as the *fulness of Jesus*, I shall here adduce the following passage from John i. 16, “*And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.*” These words were spoken of Jesus Christ, and, compared with those of Paul, plainly testify, that he and God the Father are one and the same person.

* * *

You acknowledge, p. 27, that the same titles are given to Christ, as to God. But you add, “Beings the *most different* in their natures may, in several respects, resemble one another, and act a *similar part*, so as to be entitled to the *same appellations*, without being the same persons.” And in answer to the arguments we urge from those passages in the prophets, in which Jehovah is so frequently

and so solemnly declared to be the *only Saviour*, and the *only Redeemer*, you say, that “both he who saves by another, and that other who saves by his orders and directions, may be equally called a *Saviour* ;” thus that Jesus Christ was no more a Saviour by his own power, than Moses was, who under God delivered the Israelites from Egypt, or than the judges who delivered them from their various enemies. But you forget what the prophet Isaiah says concerning Jesus who was to come into the world, that he is a Redeemer and Saviour *by his own proper power*. “Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah ? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the *greatness of his strength* ?” Who ? It is no less than Jehovah himself in human form, “*I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save*. I have trodden the wine-press *alone*, and of the people there was *none with me*. The day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of *my redeemed* is come. And I looked, and there was *none to help* ; and I wondered that there was *none to uphold* : therefore *mine own arm* brought salvation unto me, and my fury it upheld me. *I will tread down* the people in mine anger, and *I will bring down* their strength to the earth. He said, Surely they are *my people*, children that will not lye. *So he was their Saviour*,” Isa. lxiii. 1 to 8.

Now it is no where said of Moses, that he saved or delivered *by his own proper power*, but always by a power which he derived from another different from himself, namely, Jehovah, in whose name, and by whose express command he brought the Israelites out of Egypt. But of Jesus it is said, that he saved and redeemed *by his own mighty arm* ; and when any of the apostles performed miracles, it was always *in the name of Jesus*, which is a plain and full acknowledgment, that their power so to do was derived from *him alone*. To do any thing *in the name of*

the king, implies by the *authority of the king*: hence to heal the sick, the lame, the deaf, and the blind *in the name of Jesus*, means to perform those cures by the *sole power and authority of Jesus*, which nevertheless cannot belong to any mere man, but exclusively to him who is both God and Man in one person.

Of Jesus it is remarkable, that whenever he performed a miracle, or delivered a precept, it was always in *his own name*, and by *his own authority*; in this respect differing from both prophets and apostles, who constantly spake and acted in the name of *another*, attributing all their wisdom, power, and authority, to God from whom they derived them. When the chief priests and elders of the people demanded of Jesus, by what authority he did such and such things, and who gave him that authority, he refused to tell them; plainly intimating, that it was by *his own* authority, and by *none other*; for had it been derived from any other being, or had he himself been a person different from God, as a faithful prophet and messenger, he would doubtless have taken that opportunity of acknowledging his master, and ascribing honour to whom honour was due. But no such language as this was held forth by him: on the contrary, he spake as *one having (self-derived) authority*, and not as the scribes.

Moreover, it is said of Jesus, that “*he shall save his people from their sins*,” Matt. i. 21. A mere man cannot surely do this. Noah, Daniel, and Job, could deliver only *their own souls* by their righteousness, Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; and even this could not be effected without the Lord’s righteousness imparted to them. But Jesus is the Lamb of God that taketh away the *sins of the world*. He hath power to *forgive sins*, and actually *did forgive them*. Yet none can forgive sins, but God only. See Mark ii. 5, 7, 9. Luke v. 21. Herein then is Jesus distinguished

from all other prophets, and, by his divine prerogative of forgiving sins, known to be God alone.

* * *

You justly observe, p. 27, that we lay great stress on Christ being called *the Alpha and the Omega*. We do so, and consider the title as a striking characteristic of the great Jehovah. "But," say you, "this is no more a proper name of God, than *Saviour*, or *Father*. It may signify the chief, or founder of any thing; as Christ is, *under God*, of the Christian dispensation." This interpretation, however, is by no means applicable to the term *Alpha*, which being *absolutely* the first letter of the Greek alphabet, must imply that Jesus is *absolutely* the *primary* and *sole founder* of the Christian religion, not as a subordinate minister *under* another, but as the real self-existent fountain and source of all life, from whom, by whom, and for whom all things are. To put any other sense upon the appellation *Alpha*, would be to deny the import of the word, and to substitute another (*Beta*, for instance,) in its stead. Moses was the founder *under God*, of the Jewish dispensation. Was he therefore the *Alpha*? You must know, that such a title cannot belong to any one who acts *under the directions of another*, but exclusively to *that other* who gives the directions, from whom the dispensation originates, and who makes use of such instruments, as in his divine wisdom he sees most fit to promote his grand end, the salvation of mankind.

The true signification of Alpha and Omega, as applied to Jesus Christ, is, that he is the essential and only Being from first to last, from whom all things derive their existence; consequently that he is the essential and only love, the essential and only wisdom, the essential and only life in himself; and thus the essential and only Creator, Saviour, and Illustrator from himself; hence that he is the all

in all both of heaven and the church, who alone is infinite and eternal, and Jehovah the Lord. All this and infinitely more is implied in the name *Alpha and Omega*, which is given to Jesus Christ, exclusive of every other being, whether in heaven or on earth, as in Apoc. i. 8, 11. xxi. 6. xxii. 13.

* * *

You say, p. 28, that a person being occasionally denominated by the name of God, is no proof that he is God; and that Christ is no more *Jehovah our righteousness*, because he is so called in Jer. xxiii. 6, than the city Jerusalem is, she being also called by the same name in Jer. xxxiii. 16. But you, who confine your ideas to the literal sense of the Word only, give no information what we are to understand by Jerusalem being called *Jehovah our righteousness*; having, I apprehend, no method of reconciling the passage to your reason, but that which you mention in p. 25, of supposing *some error to have crept into the text*. This may be the shortest way of getting rid of the difficulty, but by no means a satisfactory one to those who believe the Word of God to be perfect, as we have it in the originals. It is, however, a curious circumstance, that you, whose whole system is founded on the *mere appearances* in certain parts of the *literal sense*, should yet urge the apparent inconsistency of one passage against us, who maintain that *every part* of the Word is to be understood *spiritually*: just as if *we* were the persons who rested in *the letter*, and *you* the advocate for *the spirit*! But, Sir, the argument is our's, not your's; and the above (if taken according to the common translation*) is one of the many passages which we have to bring forward, as proofs that the Scriptures, in

* Commentators are not all agreed about the true translation of Jer. xxxiii. 16; but in which ever way it is taken literally, the internal sense must be, that the Lord alone is entitled to the name of *Jehovah our righteousness*.

a thousand instances, are not to be understood literally, but spiritually. For that Jerusalem the city cannot be Jehovah the Creator, is self-evident; and therefore, if there be any meaning at all in calling a city by the name of Jehovah, we must have recourse to the spiritual sense, which being abstracted from persons and places, can alone afford a rational and true interpretation of the words. In this sense, Jehovah our righteousness is the Lord as to divine good; the city Jerusalem is the New Church in respect to its doctrine of charity and faith united; her name denotes her quality. Thus combining the different significations into one sentence, the spiritual meaning is simply this, That the New Church will receive its quality of love and wisdom, good and truth, charity and faith, from the Lord alone, who is himself the all of love and wisdom, the all of good and truth, and the all of charity and faith, both in the church universal, and in every individual member thereof. See what was advanced and proved concerning the Lord praying in man, p. 74; and concerning the one only source of intelligence in the universe, p. 81.]

Still you cannot believe that Jesus was God himself; for you say, "Though it should be Christ and not the *prophet's son*, that was called *Emmanuel*, which signifies *God with us*, it will not follow that he was God;" because "princes are sometimes called gods, to denote their power, and men are called devils to express their bad dispositions." That you write under the influence of a *strong prejudice* against Jesus Christ, is very manifest from the above words; although I admit you may not be sensible of it, on account of its having become *habitual* to your mind; and whatever is *habitual* or *natural* to a man, is not sensibly perceived by him. It seems you would rather allow the *prophet's son* to be called *Emmanuel*, or *God with us*, than Jesus; notwithstanding it is expressly declared at the birth of

Jesus, that then “was fulfilled that which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a *virgin* shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name *Emmanuel*, which being interpreted, is, *God with us*,” Matt. i. 22, 23. How can it be, that a mere man (as you, together with the Jews, suppose Jesus to be) could be born of a *virgin mother*? Since the creation of the world, such a thing was never heard of except in the *single instance* of our blessed Lord, who for that very reason could not be a mere man; for having no human father, the interior essence of his life or soul must be different from that of all other men; and it is well known, that every man’s soul is derived from his father, and the body from his mother.

But to bring the matter to an issue. Either you believe that Jesus had a *mere man* for his *father*, or you do not. If you believe the former, you are, in this respect, a downright Jew: I know no difference between you. If the latter, then you allow Jesus to be *more than a mere man*, in which case all you have written against him falls to the ground, and has no more weight in it than a straw. But you expressly maintain, that Jesus was no more than a mere man; therefore the whole world has a right to infer, that your *private* creed is, that Joseph, his *supposed* father, was his *actual* father.* Your system of materialism also

* Since writing the above, I have found to my great surprize, that you have publicly declared in your first Letters to the Jews, that you “do not believe in the miraculous conception of Jesus; but that you are of opinion he was the legitimate son of Joseph.” From your principles, I always supposed, that this must be your private creed; but I did not apprehend, you would venture to go the length of publishing it to the world; for I understand, the time was, when you thought it dangerous to your character, to be suspected of such an anti-christian sentiment. You deny the authenticity of the first chapter of Matthew’s gospel, possibly because Jesus is there said to be born of a virgin, and called Emmanuel, God with us. But if you admit the second of Luke to be genuine, that sufficiently proves that Jesus was not the son of Joseph. When Joseph and Mary his mother returned from Jerusalem, the child Jesus tarried behind. So they turned back, to seek him, “And when they saw him, his mother said unto

implies as much ; for whoever ascribes to matter the source of intelligence, by supposing that spirit is incapable of thinking, unless while acted upon by an influx from material substances, virtually ascribes the production of a soul, which in itself is spiritual, to causes in themselves merely natural : and by the same rule, the creation of the universe is by such a person attributed to nature, instead of God. Nay the very idea which he has of the being of a God, when explained by himself, is no other than that of nature, or which amounts to the same thing, infinite space, as expressed in your *Letters to the Members of the New Church*, p. 50. But while the Word of God endures, it must remain an eternal truth, that Jesus was conceived without the mediation of a man, deriving his soul from Jehovah the Father, and a body only from the Virgin Mary ; which soul, being of itself *indivisible*, and therefore unlike the soul of a finite man, must be Jehovah himself. Consequently the whole Divinity was included in the Lord's Humanity from his first conception ; but on the glorification of his human essence, that also was made completely divine, by the putting off or divesting himself of every thing that was derived from Mary ; and by virtue of its perfect union with the Father, who was its soul, it became the Divine Humanity, or in other words, the Visible Jehovah in a Human Form.

As to the circumstance of princes being sometimes called *gods*, on account of their great power, which you think is the reason why the name *God* is occasionally given to Jesus, without however any intention in the writer of setting him

him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, *thy father* (meaning Joseph) and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about *my Father's* business?" Luke ii. 48, 49. Here Jesus plainly denied that Joseph was his Father ; for when he was in the temple, teaching the doctors, he was not about Joseph's business, but his Father Jehovah's.

forth as the true God ; I have to observe, that an evident distinction is made in the use of the term, when applied to men or angels, and when applied to the living God. In the former case, it is usually said, that such an one is *a god*, or such and such persons are *gods*. But in the latter case, Jehovah is emphatically styled *God*, or *the God*, viz. of heaven and earth. And although in the originals the use of the particles, *a*, *the*, &c. may not be so certain and precise as in English, yet the context will invariably point out when they are to be understood, and when omitted, according to the nature of the subject treated of. Now it is worthy of notice, that whenever the term *God* is applied to Jesus, it is done in the same manner, and with the same degree of emphasis, as when applied to the great Jehovah. So in the following passages : “ They shall call his name *Emmanuel*, which being interpreted, is, *God with us*,” Matt. i. 2, 3. “ In the beginning was the Word, (Jesus,) and the Word was with God, and *God was the Word*. And the Word was made flesh,” viz. in the person of Jesus, John i. 1, 14. “ *God* (i. e. Jesus) was manifest in the flesh,” 1 Tim. iii. 16. “ This (Jesus Christ) is *the true God* and eternal life,” 1 John v. 20. “ Thy throne, *O God*, is for ever and ever,” Psalm xlv. 6. These words were spoken of Jesus Christ, and quoted by Paul, Heb. i. 8, who applies them to him as the Son of God. Whence it follows, that Jesus being distinguished by the title *God* in a manner widely different from that in which either angels or men are spoken of ; and having also names and qualities attributed to him, which can belong to none other than to the great Jehovah, he must of consequence be the sole, the supreme, the everlasting God of heaven and earth.

* * *

You think it something extraordinary, p. 28, that we, who strenuously assert the unity of God, and reject the

idea of *three divine persons*, as manifestly implying *three Gods*, should yet contend for a *trinity*, although the expression is not to be found in the Scriptures. And you conclude, rather hastily, that we have adopted the term merely as a sacrifice to popular prejudice. In this, however, you are much mistaken, as I hope to shew you presently. You even bring a charge against the writer of the Preface to the *Summary View of the Heavenly Doctrines of the New Jerusalem*. for urging as a plea in favour of Baron Swedenborg's writings, that he asserts and defends the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; which plea you treat as a mere apology addressed to the weakness and prejudices of the multitude. But you forget, or perhaps never considered, that that small pamphlet was principally intended for those who profess to believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, and not so much for Arians or Socinians, who deny it. It was therefore with great propriety that the writer addressed his readers in the language he did. Had he intended it as an appeal to Socinians, he would, without doubt, have introduced the subject in a different manner, and reasoned with them on principles more suited to their state of mind. But be this as it might, you may rest assured, that neither that writer, nor any other member of the New Church, seeks a shelter for truth in the prejudices of mankind; of which your present opposition to the doctrines we maintain, is at least one striking proof; for had we in view secretly or insensibly to insinuate our tenets into the public mind, by flattering either the weakness or errors we discovered, we should hardly have declared ourselves in so plain and open a manner as we have done. And I believe nothing but the love of truth for its own sake, together with a desire to contribute to the general happiness of mankind, has induced the members of the New Church to exert themselves in publishing and

spreading through the kingdom at large those new but grand discoveries of divine truth, of which they have received the most deliberate and powerful conviction in their own minds.

I before observed, that you object to the doctrine of a *trinity*, because that expression is not found in the Scriptures. On the same principle you may object to a thousand other words equally in use, when the subject of conversation is theology. But I apprehend it is sufficient, if the *thing* signified by *trinity* is clearly discoverable in the sacred writings; and that it is so, I think will appear from the following passages: "The angel said unto Mary, The *Holy Spirit* shall come upon thee, and the power of the *Highest* shalt overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the *Son of God*," Luke i. 35. Here mention is made of *three*, viz. the *Holy Spirit*, the *Highest*, and the *Son of God*, which is evidently the same thing as a *trinity*. Again, "When Jesus was baptized, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the *Spirit of God* descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. And lo, a *voice from heaven*, saying, This is *my beloved Son*, in whom I am well pleased," Matt. iii. 16, 17. Mark i. 10, 11. "John the Baptist bare record, saying, *He* that sent me to baptize with water, *the same* said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the *Spirit* descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the *Holy Spirit*. And I saw, and bare record, that this is the *Son of God*," John i. 32, 33, 34. In both these passages a *trinity*, though not expressed by the very term, is yet discernable by every reader. But it is more plainly declared in the following words of our Lord to his disciples, "Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Spirit*," Matt. xxviii. 19. Also in these words

of John, “There are *three* that bear record in heaven, the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Spirit*; and these *three* are *one*,” 1 John v. 7. To this may be added the further evidence arising from the circumstance of the *Lord’s* praying to his *Father*, and speaking of him, and with him, and declaring that he would send the *Holy Spirit*. The apostles also, in their epistles, make frequent mention of the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*. Hence then it is evident, that there is such a thing as a *divine trinity*, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.*

The actual existence of a trinity being thus established, it only remains to be considered in what sense we are to understand it, whether as a trinity of distinct persons in the Godhead, or as a trinity of essentials in one divine person. And as this cannot be better illustrated, than by a reference to the three general essentials of man, who is said to have been created *in the image, and after the likeness of God*, let us first see how far a human trinity can be discerned in him as a single individual, and then we shall be able in some measure to comprehend how the divine trinity exists in the single person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

“There are (says Baron Swedenborg) general, and also particular essentials of every thing, which all together constitute one essence. The general essentials of every one man, are his soul, body, and operation; and that these constitute one essence, is evident from this circumstance, that one existeth by derivation from the other, and for the sake of the other, in a continued series; for man hath his beginning from the soul, which is the very essence of the seed, and which is not only the initiating, but also the producing cause of all the parts of the body in their respective order,

* See this subject more fully treated of in Emanuel Swedenborg’s *True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church*, n. 163, to 188.

and afterwards of all acts proceeding from the soul and body united, which are called operations ; wherefore, from this circumstance of the production of one from another, and their consequent insertion and conjunction one with another, it is evident, that these three are of one essence, and therefore they are called the three essentials.

“ That these three essentials, viz. soul, body, and operation, did, and do exist in the Lord God the Saviour, is universally acknowledged. That his soul was from Jehovah the Father, can only be denied by Antichrist, for in the Word of both the Old and New Testament he is called the Son of Jehovah, the Son of the Most High God, the Only-begotten ; wherefore the divinity of the Father, answering to the soul in man, is his *first essential*. That the Son, who was born of the mother Mary, is the body of that divine soul, is a consequence of that birth, inasmuch as nothing is provided in the womb of the mother except a body, conceived by, and derived from the soul : this, therefore, is a *second essential*. That operations constitute a *third essential*, is a consequence of their proceeding from soul and body together ; for the things that proceed are of the same essence with the things from which they proceed. That the three essentials, which are Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are one in the Lord, like soul, body, and operation in man, is evident from the words of the Lord, declaring that he and the Father are one, and that the Father is in him, and he in the Father ; and that in like manner he and the Holy Spirit are one, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is the divine proceeding out of the Lord from the Father.” See *True Christian Religion*, &c. n. 166, 167.

From the above observations it is plain, that a trinity, consisting of three essentials, is necessary to the full constitution of every single man ; for were we to suppose any one of the essentials to be wanting, in that case man would

not be man, in the proper sense of the word. As for example, let us picture to our imagination a man destitute of his first essential, which is the soul; what is he but a lifeless corpse, a mere lump of earth? So in respect to the second essential, what idea should we form of a soul without an organized body, wherein it may reside and be manifested, as in its proper form? Or how could it exist in such a state of abstraction from all substance, as to have neither eyes to see, ears to hear, nor any other organs by which it might perceive the delights of life? Would it even amount to so much as a vapour, or breath of wind? We know that such a *mere soul* as this never did nor can exist; for without a substance there can be no property; and that, of which nothing can be predicated, must be a non-entity. Again, supposing both a soul and body to exist, without a third essential called operation, what would a man in such case be, but a mere statue? Nay, would not the two first essentials, viz. soul and body, fall into decay, and perish, without the third, which is their proceeding operation; just as love and wisdom would perish, without their third essential, which is use?

A trinity, then, is absolutely necessary to the existence of man, as well as of every created subject in the universe; and notwithstanding your assertion, p. 30, that “the three terms,” or three essentials, “are not correlative, having no proper correspondence,” it is manifest that they bear the most intimate and strict relation to each other, and form the most perfect correspondence, that unity of essence can produce. As you do not admit, any more than myself, the doctrine of a *trinity of divine persons*, such an idea evidently amounting to a *trinity of Gods*, it is unnecessary, in writing to you, Sir, to point out the absurdity of such a notion, which even many of the Athanasian trinitarians

themselves now begin to be ashamed of.* Suffice it to observe, that as man was created in the image and likeness of God, and as in him is clearly discernible a human trinity of soul, body, and operation, and yet he is but one man both in essence and person; so we have both reason and Scripture to conclude, that in the Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ there is a divine trinity, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and yet he is but one God both in essence and in person.

* * *

Having now refuted, either directly or indirectly, every objection you have urged against the divinity of Jesus Christ; and having proved, that he alone is the supreme Lord of heaven and earth, in whom the complete trinity resides, or, as Paul expresses it, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; I will add a few remarks on the closing part of your third Letter.

You address the members of the New Church in the following terms, p. 30. “With a change in your phraseology, and very little in your ideas, you are as proper Unitarians, as we who are usually called *Socinians*. For we say, that the *Word*, by which all things were created, and which dwelt in Christ, was the *one true God*, besides whom there is no other, and that without this divine principle Christ was a mere man, as other men are.” That we are Unit-

* Some of the most eminent among the Athanasian trinitarians, seeing the absurdity of supposing, that the one God can exist in *three persons*, instead of this phrase substitute that of *three offices* or *characters*. Hereby indeed they evade one absurdity; but they entangle themselves in another, namely, in praying to *one office* for the sake of *another office*, that it would be pleased to send a *third office* to sanctify and regenerate them. Thus instead of addressing God as an *object*, a *substance*, and a *form*, they call upon *three offices* one after another, when yet an office, as such, has neither eyes to see, nor ears to hear their wants. God, then, does not consist in three offices, any more than in three persons; but he consists in *divinity* and *humanity* united in one person, from which proceeds *holy operation*, and these three, when distinctly conceived by the human intellect, may most properly be termed *three essentials* of one God, answering to a similar distinction in man, of *soul*, *body*, and *spirit*, or *proceeding operation*.

rians, and that in the true and proper sense of the word, (though not as generally understood,) I admit; for we insist upon the absolute, unequivocal unity of God, as the fundamental principle of all religion, particularly of the new and true Christian religion, which we profess. But while we assert the unity of God, we also maintain a divine trinity, not of persons, like the Athanasian trinitarians, but of three essentials in one person, as already explained. Why then do you endeavour to make the world believe, that the principles of the New Church are but a step removed from those of Socinianism? I hope you do not mean to rank every one among the number of Socinians, who believes that there is only one God. Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans, agree in this point; and what is more, they, *in common with Socinians*, and too many others who *call themselves Christians*, all unite in worshiping *the same unknown God*; with this difference, however, that Christians might know, if they would, in preference to all others in the world, who the one living and true God is, namely, the Saviour and Redeemer of the world, Jesus Christ. Imagining that it was scarcely possible for any description of Christians to stand forward in defence of the absolute unity of God, except those of similar principles with yourself, it seems you have thought yourself justifiable in declaring that the members of the New Jerusalem must be something akin to Socinians, because the divine unity is their first and fundamental article. But you have certainly been too hasty in drawing such a conclusion; for I assure you, that no two descriptions of men in the universe are more opposed to each other, with respect to theological principles, than the *Socinian* and the *member of the New Jerusalem*. I will not even except the *Jew*; for he, not having received a Christian education, does not form so full and perfect a contrast to the true Christian, as

a Socinian does, and is therefore on that account less guilty than he, for denying the divinity of Jesus Christ, and ranking him as a mere man. Nay, it appears very plainly from Mr. David Levi's Letters to you, Sir, that did he but believe the authenticity of the New Testament, he would not hesitate a moment to acknowledge the divinity of Jesus Christ, because he says it is therein asserted from beginning to end; and he wonders, with great reason and justice, how any person can call himself a Christian, who, like you, Sir, rejects the chief corner-stone of Christianity. The immense difference between your system and our's, I have already noticed in a former part of this *Defence*; to which I shall here add the following observation, That so far from there being any agreement, either in words or in reality, between Socinianism and the religion of the New Church, the relation which the former bears to the latter is like that of darkness to light, cold to heat, the nadir to the zenith, shadow to substance, matter to spirit, falshood to truth, the worship of a God in the shape of infinitely-extended space, (which is the same thing as no God at all,) to the worship of the true and living God in a Human Form, who is the adorable and ever-blessed Lord of the universe, Jesus Christ.

You acknowledge, that the Word, by which all things were created, and which dwelt in Christ, was the one true God, besides whom there is no other; but you do not allow that Jesus Christ was himself that Word, he being, as you say, no more than a mere man that had no existence till his birth in this world. Now if it can be made to appear from Scripture, that Jesus Christ himself was that Word, by whom all things were created, I hope you will be candid enough to renounce your errors, embrace truth for the sake of truth, and like a man and a Christian, submit to acknowledge him as your Creator and sovereign, who conde-

scended so far as to clothe himself with flesh and bones for the redemption and salvation of you, in common with all his other fallen creatures.

The evangelist John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word.* All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. And *the Word was made flesh*, and dwelt among us," John i. 1, 3, 14. Here it is expressly declared, first, that God was the Word, by whom all things were created; and secondly, that *the same God was made flesh*, and dwelt among us. To be made flesh can have no other meaning, than to become a *Man*. God therefore, having become *flesh*, when the *Word* became *flesh*, must at the same time have actually become a *Man*. This, Sir, is a conclusion drawn even from *your own premises*, to which I wish you to pay particular attention. How you will reconcile it to your declaration, p. 50, where you deny that God has any thing of a human form, I must leave to your ingenuity. I own I am incapable of doing it for you; and I fear the dilemma, in which I see you involved, is so absolute, that you have no way left to extricate yourself, but by an honest and candid confession of your mistake.

Again, Jesus Christ, you acknowledge, was the only man in whom the Word dwelt. But there was in him no flesh belonging to the Word, different from his own flesh. Therefore, both by Scripture and your own concessions, the flesh of Jesus Christ must be that very flesh which John meant, when he said, "*The Word was made flesh*." Hence I infer, that Jesus Christ, who was the Word made flesh, was also the true God that created heaven and earth.

In Apoc. iv. 11, the four and twenty elders fell down,

* This translation is according to the original Greek.

and said, "Thou art worthy, *O Lord*, to receive glory, and honour, and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created." In chap. v. 12, ten thousand times ten thousand cried out, "saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the *Lamb* that was *slain*, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." Here the same glory, honour, and power, are ascribed to the Lamb that was slain, (i. e. to Jesus who was crucified,) as to the Lord the Creator of all things. Therefore I conclude in the words of Paul, that "by him (Jesus Christ) were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him," Col. i. 16.

Further: "*In the Word was life*, and the life was the *light* of men," John i. 4. Jesus says, "*I am the way, the truth, and the life*," John xiv. 6. *I am the light* of the world," chap. viii. 12. You say the Word only dwelt in Jesus, as something distinct from him, but was not in reality Jesus. But by the above passages it is evident, that Jesus, who was the life and light of men, was *in the Word*, as well as the Word *in him*: so that whatever is said of the one, may be equally applied to the other also. Hence again results my first and last position, viz. That Jesus Christ alone is God.

It is said of the Word of God, that *he sat* upon a white horse; that he is called Faithful and True; that he doth *judge* and *make war*; that he had *eyes* like a flame of fire; that on *his head* were many crowns; that he had a name written which no man knew but *himself*; that he was *clothed* in a vesture dipt in *blood*; that out of *his mouth* went a sharp sword; that *he treadeth the wine-press* of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God; and that he

hath on *his vesture* and on *his thigh* a name written, *King of kings, and Lord of lords*, Apoc. xix. 11 to 16. The whole of the above is evidently the description of one in a *Human Form*; and yet it is expressly said to be that of the *Word of God*. The Word of God is therefore a *Man*—a *King*—a *Lord*. But that it is no other than the Divine Man Jesus Christ, is plain from the particulars of the description, which are elsewhere applied to him in nearly the same terms. As for instance, it is said of Jesus, that he is the *faithful* and *true* witness, Apoc. i. 5. chap. iii. 14; that all *judgment* is committed unto the *Son*, John v. 22; that the *Lamb* shall overcome, in *war*, the ten kings, for he is *Lord of lords, and King of kings*, Apoc. xvii. 14; that the eyes of the Son of Man were as a *flame of fire*, Apoc. i. 14: that out of his mouth went a *sharp two-edged sword*, verse 16; that he had a *new name* written, which no man knoweth, but he who receiveth it, Apoc. ii. 17; and of our Saviour Jesus Christ it is said, in allusion to the work of redemption accomplished by him, that he *trod the wine-press alone*, and that his *garments were stained with blood*, Isaiah lxiii. 3. Seeing then the very same things are alike spoken of the Word, which you have acknowledged to be God, and of Jesus Christ whom you consider as a mere man, it follows, that the *Son of God* and the *Word of God* are one and the same divine principle, both having been made flesh in the single *person* of our Lord Jesus Christ.

To make it, if possible, still more manifest and undeniable, that the Word of God and Jesus Christ are the same, I shall add the following considerations. In the first chapter of John's gospel, it is said of John the Baptist, that he came to bear witness of the *Word*, as its immediate forerunner, “and he cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me, is preferred before me;

for He was before me," verse 15. In the same chapter the same words are applied to Jesus Christ, in the most decided and unequivocal manner : " The next day John seeth *Jesus* coming unto him, and saith, behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. *This is He* of whom I said, After me cometh a *Man*, which is preferred before me ; for *He was before me*," verse 29, 30. In the first passage John evidently speaks of the *Word* ; and in the latter he says expressly that *Jesus is he* of whom he spake. It is also said, verse 14, that the *Word* was full of *grace and truth* ; and in verse 16, that *grace and truth* came by *Jesus Christ*. The *Word* is called the true *light* which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, verse 9 : and Jesus says, "*I am the light of the world*," chap. viii. 12. And further, Paul declares, 1 Cor. i. 24, that Christ is the *wisdom of God*. Now the wisdom of God can be no other than the *Word of God*. Therefore the truth of my proposition again appears, That the Word of God, and Jesus Christ the Son of God, are one and the same divine principle manifested in the flesh ; consequently, that as the Word of God is the true God, who was made flesh, so Jesus Christ is the same God who manifested himself in a Human Form.

* * *

You ask p. 30, " What is the difference, excepting in words, between saying that Jesus was a man *united* to God, and a man *inspired by God*, when in this case you cannot pretend to have any proper idea of the word *united*, or can say wherein it differs from *inspired* ?" If there be no difference in the meaning of the two expressions *united* and *inspired*, why do you object so much to the use of the former, when speaking of Jesus, and insist that the latter only is applicable to him ? You know that the term *union* implies such an incorporation of two principles into one, as to

preclude every idea of separability: whereas the term *inspiration* bears no such signification. A man may be *inspired* by God, as the prophets were, to write or utter whatever may be dictated to him: but he is not therefore *united* to God; for it is possible he may still be an ungodly or disobedient man, as was the case with several of the prophets mentioned in the Old Testament, viz. Balaam, Jonah, Hosea, &c. To be *united* is to become *one* like soul and body in man, or like heat and light in the sun's rays, or like essence and form, affection and thought, cause and effect. These comparisons, though they may sufficiently explain my meaning, yet fall infinitely short of conveying a perfect idea of the intimate union subsisting between the Lord's Divinity and Humanity; for the subject being in itself divine, and of course infinite, the full knowledge thereof must ever transcend all finite capacities, whether human or angelical. Nevertheless, as we are so constituted, that an idea of the Divine Being can in some small degree be formed in a finite understanding, it is lawful for us to illustrate the mode of his existence by such things in the created world as may be supposed most to resemble it.

Such then being our idea of the *union* subsisting between Jesus and the Father, or the Humanity and the Divinity, and such the difference between it and mere *inspiration*, say not that we confound the one with the other, or that we are incapable of distinguishing between them. We know how to ascertain the difference between *union*, *conjunction*, and *inspiration*; *union* having respect to Jesus and the Father, *conjunction* to man and the Lord, and *inspiration* to the descent of divine truth from heaven to earth, particularly as manifested in the holy Word. No *mere man* can ever be so united to Jehovah, as to be *one with him*. In the person of Jesus alone such *union* was effected;

for he says, “*All things that the Father hath are mine,*” John xvi. 15. “I and my Father are *one*,” chap. x. 30. Wherefore he alone must be a Divine Man. The union subsisting between the Lord and his church, considered as mere men, is more properly termed *conjunction*, because it is between two parties who are still separate and distinct from each other, and must for ever remain so; for the ardour of the divine essence is so intense, that were any mere creature to approximate too near it, he would instantly be consumed like a stick thrown into the body of the sun. *Inspiration*, again, differs both from union and conjunction in this, that the person inspired may have no perception in himself of the truth of what he asserts, being no more than a kind of passive organ for spirits to speak by or through. Several of the prophets were, during the time of their inspiration, *possessed of spirits*, who occupied their bodies according to their own pleasure; in which situation some appeared to be insane, as Saul, when he stripped himself, and lay down naked all day and all night; see 1 Sam. xix. 24. Others received their inspiration by dreams and visions, consequently when they were not in the use of their external faculties. But those prophets, by whom the Word was written, for the most part merely wrote down what was dictated to them by spirits from the Lord, the very words which they wrote having been first audibly pronounced in their ears.

After saying, that Man and God are more different in their natures, than the iron and clay in Nebuchadnezzar’s image, and as incapable of forming any proper union, as those substances; from your great desire for our conversion, you add, p. 31, “Say then, in intelligible language, that Jesus was a man, but that God was with him, and acted by him; and we shall be agreed in words, as well as in reality, and every desirable consequence will flow from it.

You will then, as now, disclaim all plurality of Gods, together with different persons in the trinity, and you will effectually secure the truth of all the declarations of Christ, as proceeding from God, *just as much as if he himself had been God.*” We already declare, in language sufficiently intelligible, that Jesus is a man; but we go further, and acknowledge him to be the *Only Man* in the universe, from whom all other men derive those very faculties which constitute them men. Every rational and considerate person knows, that man is not man merely by virtue of his external form or body, but principally by virtue of his spirit or soul, which is a form recipient of love and wisdom from God. This form we call the will and understanding, his will being a receptacle of love with all its derivative affections, and his understanding being a receptacle of wisdom with all its derivative thoughts. These are the fundamental constituent principles of humanity, without which man would be no better than a brute beast, but in proportion to his reception of which he becomes more and more a man. If then love and wisdom, or, which is the same thing, good and truth, are the only proper standard of humanity, from which even the human form itself is derived; how plain is it to see, that God, who is the sole fountain of love and wisdom, must be the *Only Man*, from whom all others are by derivation called men! And how rational to suppose, that as the human soul, which is a mere receptacle of life, assumes to itself a body which it forms into its own likeness, so Jehovah, who is essential life, has assumed to himself an actual Humanity, by virtue of which he is now the only self-existent Man in ultimate or last principles, as he was from all eternity the only Man in first principles.

From the above specimen of our sentiments concerning the Humanity of Jesus Christ, you will readily perceive,

Sir, that the members of the New Church agree with you neither in words, nor in reality. And although with you we disclaim a trinity of divine persons, as amounting to the same thing as a trinity of Gods, yet we do it upon quite different principles from those of a Socinian. The principles on which we build, are the following : 1. That there is one God only, whose essence is love and wisdom. 2. That love and wisdom must belong to a substance, yea, must be a substance, whose form is verily Human ; consequently that the one God, the Creator of the universe, is a Divine Man. 3. That the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is that one God. 4. That the Word of God contains a spiritual as well as a literal sense ; that it is holy and divine in every part ; that there is nothing in it redundant by human interpolations, or defective by omissions of negligence ; the Divine Providence of the Lord having preserved it entire, in the original languages, till the present day. These are all *affirmative* principles, leading the mind to the true knowledge of things as they are, and thus to the positive perception of the delights of wisdom, as manifested in the two kingdoms of spirit and nature. But the principles from which you reason, are all of a *negative* quality, and in direct opposition to our's, being as follow : 1. That there is one God of whose essence we know nothing at all, p. 61. 2. That the substance of this God is equally unknown to us ; that he has no form at all much less a human form ; but if he has any form, it can be no other than that of infinite space, p. 44, 49, 50. 3. That Jesus Christ has nothing of divinity residing in him as his own, being no more than any common man, p. 21, 24, 30, 60. 4. That the Word of God does not contain a spiritual sense ; that in various parts it is neither holy nor divine, but absolutely false, in consequence of the interpolations and dangerous glosses of

designing men, which the Divine Providence has never interfered to prevent, p. 17, 57.*

Such is the difference between your principles and those of the New Church, which I have thus contrasted, for the purpose of preventing any person mistaking the one for the other. You seem indeed to think it is of no consequence whither Jesus be God or not ; for you say, that if we will but set him down as a mere man, by whom God acted, we shall “ effectually secure the truth of all the declarations of Christ, as proceeding from God, *just as much as if he himself had been God ;*” which declaration of your’s, if it has any meaning at all, must argue, that you consider it the same thing whether we worship the true God, or a false God ; for in either case, you intimate, the consequences will be the same. Thus you make no distinction between truth and error, and that in a point which is of the highest moment, and on which our everlasting welfare depends.

The confession of a God, and the declaration that he is one, without knowing or caring *who he is*, may do very well for a Socinian, but never for a member of the New Jerusalem. With us it is by no means an indifferent matter whether Jesus Christ, or any other, be the true God ; for according to the idea we entertain of God, such must the whole system of our theology be, which is founded thereon. If Jesus be not God, then the Scriptures fall to the ground, and perish ; revelation must be a dream, and all religion a farce. But if Jesus be God, then the Scriptures remain in their purity, and we can understand them, as testifying, from beginning to end, of Him alone. Therefore Him only are we bound to acknowledge ; Him only to worship, as Creator from

* See also Dr. Priestley’s first Letter to the Jews, p. 41 ; and his second Letter, part 2, p. 10, where he asserts, that the first chapter of Matthew is not authentic, and that the gospel of Luke “ abounds with the most manifest improbabilities.”

eternity, Redeemer in time, and Regenerator for evermore. He alone is Father, He alone is Son, and He alone is Holy Spirit. Jehovah of hosts is his name, the Holy One of Israel, the mighty God of Jacob. He is Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End, the I AM, who is, who was, and who is to come, the Almighty. Thus there is one Lord, one God in the church, who out of his great love and mercy hath, by the assumption of Humanity, made himself visible, approachable, and in some measure comprehensible as a DIVINE MAN. To Him be glory and dominion for ages of ages. Amen.

ROBERT HINDMARSH.

LETTER III.

Miscellaneous.

HAVING in the preceding Letters, I trust, sufficiently obviated the objections which you raise against the divinity of Jesus Christ, as well as against the extraordinary commission of Baron Swedenborg, I propose, Sir, in the present Letter, to make such further remarks as the remainder of your objections shall appear to require. The subjects, on which I may be led to speak, being various, my observations will naturally be of a miscellaneous kind.

* * *

I. *Of the Connection between Religion and the Civil Power.*

In p. 2, you say, that the members of the New Church “assign the same source to the corruptions of Christianity,” as you do, viz. “false philosophy, and the interference of the civil powers in matters of religion.” From what authority you take upon you to assert this, I know not. This, however, is most certain, that we by no means agree with you in these points. False philosophy, indeed, or such as is founded on the mere fallacies of nature, as your system of materialism most evidently is, has been one great cause of excluding from the human mind all perception of spiritual and divine truth; for while the understanding is shackled by, and confirmed in, the *appearances* of truth,

every thing will be seen in an inverted point of view. So far therefore as men have reasoned from fallacious principles, so far have they contributed to the corruption of Christianity as existing in the present day, whether it has been done in favour of a trinity of divine persons, or in opposition to the one and only true God Jesus Christ.

But I cannot pass over in silence your assertion, that we assign, with you, as the cause of the corruptions of Christianity, “the interference of the civil powers in matters of religion ;” which interference of the civil powers you call, in the same page, a “most unnatural alliance with the church of Christ.” Now, Sir, if you had given the writings of Baron Swedendorg a deliberate and attentive perusal, and thereby informed yourself of the true drift of the New Jerusalem doctrines, (which, previous to any attempt to confute them, you certainly ought to have done,) you might easily have discovered, that even in this particular we differ very essentially from you. We consider religion, or what in the present case amounts to the same thing, Christianity, to be an *active* principle in man, influencing his life and conduct *in all the civil concerns of society* ; and not as an *abstract theory* floating in the brain, without any application to uses of life. Hence it is, that we consider an alliance between the church and state, in any country, to be similar to the alliance between the soul and body ; and that as in the latter case both ought to correspond and act in conjunction for the good of an individual, so likewise in the former case both ought to be united in giving energy and effect to the welfare of a community.

Of these sentiments of our’s you might have been apprized before now ; for having occasion to write on this subject in the Preface to the English translation of Baron Swedenborg’s *Brief Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church*, published in 1789, I there in a few words stated

the wisdom and propriety of there being a settled, established, or prevailing religion in every nation; though I did not take upon me to point out what that religion ought to be in each country. If you will give me leave, I will here transcribe what I then asserted, and still acknowledge, as my sincere opinion, and most mature judgment.

“*Every government in every country is influenced by the religion prevalent therein.* This is a truth, which, the more it is considered, will, I believe, the more fully be acknowledged. Agreeably hereto, all wise governments have seen the necessity of having an established church, which should be so united to the civil state, as to constitute its very life or soul; for the relation subsisting between the church and state, in every country, exactly resembles that which subsists between the soul and body in man. The operations of both are likewise similar. Thus the laws and customs of civil life are to the religious principles of a nation, just what the actions of the body are to the secret purposes of the soul. Hence it is, that penetrating statesmen dread the smallest alteration in the ecclesiastical laws, as dangerous to the present system of politics; because they know, that if the main spring of action receives a new inclination, all the wheels of government must necessarily submit to a different motion. On this ground it was, that a noble Lord (Lord North, afterwards the Earl of Guilford,) in the British senate, with great propriety asserted, “That the church and state were so intimately connected, that they have ever gone, and still go, hand in hand, and must both stand or fall together.” *Preface to Brief Exposition, first edition, page xlvii.*

In addition to the above, I would here observe, that every society of men, whether large or small, considered as to the uses which they mutually perform to each other, and viewed interiorly, is actually in a human form; so much so,

that all the individuals therein, taken collectively, are viewed by an intellectual mind as forming only one man.* The case is precisely the same with a whole nation, which is a large society of men uniting together in one common interest, and thus constituting one body, of which the king (where monarchical government prevails) is the head ; the executive power, or magistrates, the arms ; merchants, manufacturers, and producers, constitute the trunk of the body ; women the loins ; and labourers the legs and feet. Such is the view of a whole nation, when considered as to the general uses of life : and as it is *use* which forms the individual into the human likeness, so is it *use* also which reduces a whole nation into the complete form of a single man. The same may be said of all the nations of the earth : as to the uses they perform, they are all viewed by the Lord as one man.

Now, as it is highly proper, that every individual man should be possessed of a deliberate and settled judgment in matters of religion, which may serve as the secret spring from whence all the actions of his life ought to be derived ; so should the grand man of the nation have a settled, established religion, from which, as from an internal dictate of justice, which may be called the national conscience, all his

* Mr. Paine, in his *Rights of Man*, part 2, p. 34, says, " A nation is *not* a body, the figure of which is to be represented by the *human body* ; but is like a body contained within a *circle*, having a common centre, in which every radius meets ; and that centre is formed by representation." Such is the principle, upon which a great part of this author's reasoning is founded, But it is fallacious, because contrary to the true order of things both in the spiritual and the natural world : for to suppose, that the circumference of a circle produces the centre, is the same thing as to suppose, that the outer gives birth to the inner, that the trunk and feet produce the head, that the body produces the soul, or that the effect, which is posterior, produces the cause, which is prior. Nay, upon the same principles the visible world must be considered as having derived its existence from a general fortuitous conflux of particles or atoms from the wide expanse of infinitely extended space, till at last they arranged themselves into the present orderly system, and produced the sun as their centre. Thus the assumption of one false principle, founded on fallacious appearances, and confirmed by reasonings of ingenuity, leads to the perversion and utter extinction of truth, by ascribing the creation of the universe to nature, and not to God.

acts of legislation and jurisprudence ought to flow. The nation that is without an established, or at least an avowed religion, is like a man destitute of any fixed principle; what he does to-day, he may undo to-morrow; and every action discovers ignorance, caprice, and folly. But while I say thus much, do not so far misunderstand me, as to suppose, that I prefer the present established religion to the religion of the New Church. By no means. Yet, I conceive it to be a duty incumbent on every member of the community to contribute, as a citizen, towards the support of that religion, which the government, legally constituted, has thought proper to approve and adopt; for on any other principle, I do not see how the general interests and peace of the nation can be secured, which nevertheless every individual is bound to support, in return for the protection afforded him by the laws. No society can exist, unless its members are kept in due obedience to those in office; and so long as the government will allow to the people the free and peaceable enjoyment of their own religious opinions, it is all that can or ought to be expected. As members of the New Church, we no doubt could wish that our religion were the established religion of the land, because we believe it to be more pure and universal than any other. But we are far from desiring to force our opinions on any man, as knowing that nothing short of a deliberate, rational conviction of the truth can be of any service. We therefore rest contented with the present dispensation of divine providence, and, thankful for the many blessings we already enjoy, pray for a more general reception of divine truth in the world at large, that men may freely and of their own accord embrace the new and true Christian religion, as described in the Apocypse under the character of the holy city New Jerusalem.

Such are the sentiments of the New Church, which I be-

lieve none of her members are ashamed to avow. Liberty of conscience is all we demand : and as for the honours and emoluments of civil or ecclesiastical offices, we leave them to those who can conscientiously comply with the conditions on which they are bestowed. The church of England may have enemies among certain Dissenters, merely because it is an established church : but we object to it upon no such grounds, but solely because it worships a plurality of Gods, opposes the exclusive divinity of Jesus Christ, and fixes a barrier, not easily to be surmounted, against the free reception of genuine truth in this land. As members of the New Jerusalem, however, and men of peace, we wage war with neither Jew nor Gentile ; the walls of our city are a sufficient bulwark against all that may assault us ; and we are not so *over-anxious* about the success of our doctrines, as to use compulsive measures for their propagation, were it even in our power so to do, because we know that no other reception of them than such as is grounded in *freedom* and *rationality* can be either genuine or permanent ; and besides, our confidence in the truth is so great, that we doubt not but it will effectually, though gradually, clear its own way, against all opposition, purely by dint of its own native authority. *Magna est veritas, et prævalebit.*

* * *

II. *Of the Human Form of God.*

Page 3 and 63, you say you agree with us “in the important belief of one God, and of *one person* in the God-head.” A *person*, you know, is a *man*, the word never conveying any other idea than that of a human substance and form. But in p. 50, you expressly deny that God has any such form, though you have no objection to his being in a *globular* form ; for by attributing to him the shape of

infinite space, you in fact acknowledge that his form is that of a perfect *sphere* or *globe*. The phantasy of such a notion as this, scarcely requires a serious thought ; it is its own reproach, and a disgrace to human understanding. To suppose, that He, whose wisdom produced all the various forms of animated beauty, and, as the very perfection of all beauty and sublimity united, the human form, should yet himself be in the shape of inanimate matter, like this globe of earth, or the vast space in which it revolves, is an idea so absurd, so irrational, so degrading to a being of infinite wisdom, that I am astonished how any one can for a moment give it a place in his mind. But I perceive, the reason of your falling into this gross error is, because you form all your ideas of the divine omnipresence from and according to time and space, which, however, bear no proper relation to what is spiritual or divine, as I hope presently to demonstrate.

With what propriety you say of yourself, that you agree with us in ascribing *personality* to God, while at the same time you deny him the *form of a person*, is not easy to be conceived. The form and substance of a brute is never called a *person* by any judicious writer that I know of ; still less proper would it be to call inanimate matter a *person*, let its form be what it may : the term, therefore, is solely applicable to a *human form*, and by no means to a being of an infinitely extended shape, as you suppose God to be. “ The greatest puzzle of all,” you say, “ is, to ascribe to him the form of a man :” yet by pronouncing the Divine Being to be a *person*, and by informing the world that you *agree with us* in such a belief, you have, at least in this particular, virtually acknowledged that he is a *Man*, and thereby admitted a sentiment plainly contradictory to the rest of your notions.

But that this sentiment forms no part of your real creed,

(having, as I apprehend, crept into your *Letters* by mere accident, without design or reflection,) is pretty evident from the great pains you have taken to abolish the idea of God's existing in a human form. For "this opinion," you say, p. 50, "besides being highly degrading to the Divine Being, has no countenance from the Scriptures, or from reason." But herein you lie under a gross mistake; for both the Scriptures and sound reason testify that God is a Man. Whenever mention is made of Jehovah in the Old Testament, or of the Lord God in the New Testament, he is uniformly represented and spoken of as having the form of a man or an angel, which is one and the same thing. The following proofs will relieve me from the censure of dealing in mere assertions.

I. In the very first chapter of Genesis, it is expressly said, that God created man *in his own image*; the simplest and plainest inference from which is, that God himself must be in a human form. How else can it be said, that man is an *image* and *likeness* of God? Were a statuary to form the image of a man, and when he had finished it to say, that he had made a statue *in his own image and likeness*; would not every person who saw the work, and doubted not the accuracy of the performance, naturally conclude concerning the person of the artist, that it was exactly such, as to form and appearance, as his image represented? Why then should we dispute the Word of God himself, when he so solemnly and expressly declares that he created man in his own image and likeness? If the form of God be, as you say, no other than that of infinite space, why was not man created in such a form, that is (as before observed,) in the form of a perfect sphere or globe? For I cannot conceive that any other finite form is at all representative of infinite extension on all sides. But man was not created in such a form; therefore God, of whom

he is an image and likeness, is not infinitely extended, but in the complete form of Man.

2. In Gen. iv. 4, Cain said to Jehovah, "Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth ; and from *thy face* shall I be hid." And, verse 16, "Cain went out from the *presence of Jehovah*." Here Jehovah is addressed and considered in all respects as if he was in a human form.

3. When men began to build the city and tower of Babel, "Jehovah *came down* to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded," Gen. xi. 5. Here again Jehovah is spoken of, not as being infinitely extended, but as a Man *coming down* from heaven, with *eyes* to see the building. In many other places he is represented as *speaking, seeing, hearing, walking, standing thinking, writing, eating, swearing, repenting, coming down, going up, &c. &c.* all which expressions evidently imply a form, and several of them denote acts that exclusively indicate the human form. See Gen. xvii. 1, 9 to 22 ; xviii. 1, 8, 13, 21, 33. Exod. xxiv. 12 ; xxxii. 14.

4. As you seem to ridicule the idea of God being in a human form before the incarnation, as well as since, and wonder whether he had arms and legs, and whether he ever made use of them in removing from place to place, I shall refer you, for an answer to your curious inquiries, to those prophets who have seen God, and were sent by him. "Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, saw the God of Israel and there was under *his feet* as it were a paved work of sapphire-stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not *his hand* : also they saw God, and did eat and drink," Exod. xxiv. 9, 10, 11. Jehovah himself said to Moses, who desired to see his glory, "Behold, there is a place *by*

me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock. And it shall come to pass, while my glory *passeth by*, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with *my hand* while *I pass by*. And I will take away *my hand*, and thou shalt see *my back-parts*; but *my face* shall not be seen," Exod. xxxiii. 21, 22, 23. "God *came* from Teman," says Habakkuk, "and the Holy One from mount Paran. He *stood*, and measured the earth. Thou didst *march* through the land in indignation; thou *wentest forth* for the salvation of thy people; thou didst *walk* through the sea with thine horses," chap. iii. 3 to 15. The prophet Nahum says, "The clouds are the dust of *his feet*," chap. i. 3. And "the Lord *stood* upon a wall made by a plumb-line, with a plumb-line in *his hand*," Amos vii. 7. Lastly, the prophet Ezekiel, in his amazingly sublime vision of the four living creatures and the wheels, describes the great Jehovah in respect to the Word as having the form and likeness of a Man. "This was their appearance," says he, "they had the *likeness of a Man*. And above the firmament that was over their heads, was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire-stone, and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a *Man* above upon it. And I saw as the colour of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it: from the appearance of *his loins* even upward, and from the appearance of *his loins* even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of *Jehovah*. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a *voice of one that spake*," Ezek. i. 4, 26, 27, 28.

In all these passages Jehovah, even before the incarnation, is spoken of as a Man. A face, hands, feet, loins, and back-parts, are ascribed to him. He came, marched, went forth, walked, stood, passed by, and spake. Nay, he is

even expressly declared to have the *likeness and appearance of a Man* upon a throne. Then blame not the members of the New Church for ascribing to Jehovah a Divine Human Form; for while they give credit to the Holy Scriptures, they cannot help believing that God is a Man. I do not here enter into the spiritual sense of the above passages, because I believe you are not disposed to accompany me into regions which are so far elevated above time and space. I must, therefore, in a great measure confine myself to the material system, and speak to you in your own language, that is, according to the mere literal sense of Scripture; though I dare say, that in the above and similar passages which do not agree with your idea of an *infinitely extended Being*, you have recourse to figure and metaphor. The Holy Scriptures, however, are not written, in any part whatever, by mere *tropes, figures, or metaphors*, but every-where by *correspondences*; the difference between which and bare figurative expression I must reserve for explanation in another place.

“To give to God the form of man,” you say, p. 50, “is to assign him all the functions of man, and a mode of life similar to that of man. The form of any particular animal, beast, fowl, or fish, is adapted to its own occasions, and to nothing else. If the form be changed, as from a caterpillar to a butterfly, the whole mode of life is changed in proportion. In fact, therefore, to give to the Divine Being the form of a man, is to make him a man, and nothing more. In like manner should the form of a horse be given to a man, it would be nothing less than changing the man into a horse.”

When we assign to God the form of a Man, you should recollect that we consider him a *Divine and Infinite Man*, whose functions and mode of life must also be infinite and divine. We are the farthest in the world from ascribing

to him mere human properties, or any thing that borders on mutability and imperfection. We say he is and must be a *substance*, because all other substances are derived from him; and as we are assured that no substance can exist without a *form*, therefore we are under the necessity of ascribing to God some form or other. But we know of none equal in dignity and majesty to the *human form*; and our conceptions of divinity are such, as to lead us to select, out of the infinite variety of forms with which the universe abounds, that which alone appears the fittest for an intelligent Being to reside in, namely the *Human*, as being the very *perfection of form*, and that to which all other forms bear some reference or analogy. Hence we take up the sentiments of the wisest among the ancients, and say with them, that *Man is a mortal God*, and *God is an Immortal Man*.

This idea of God being in the form of a Man, is universal, having its residence in the *interiors* of every rational creature, in consequence of an universal influx from Him who is the *Only Man*. Even you yourself, Sir, although by external reasonings and persuasions you may endeavour to stifle the conviction, cannot possibly divest yourself of it. It appears, when you are least aware of it, in your writings, discourses, and conversation. You attribute to him will, understanding, eyes, ears, a mouth, hands, &c. &c. for these are all implied in your acknowledging that he is *merciful* and *wise*, that he *sees* and *hears*, *speaks* and *acts*, &c. &c. In short, you speak of him in all respects as a Man, assigning him functions of life that in many cases are only predicable of the human form; and although you ridicule the notion of his being either *male* or *female*, yet your constant language characterizes him as a *male*. “*He is invisible*,” you say, p. 61, “but *he* is the maker and constant preserver of all things. This great Being has commissioned

various men, and especially Jesus Christ, to communicate *his* will to mankind, and *he* always sanctioned their missions by the power of working miracles," &c. Again, "God *who* is invisible and omnipresent, *sees* and *hears* us wherever we are, and *his* power extends to all persons, and all things," p. 63. Many other passages might be quoted, wherein you equally admit, by implication, that God is a Man. If you say you are *obliged* to use such expressions on account of the imperfection of human language; I answer, It is no such thing, but an effect *spontaneously, unpremeditatedly, and naturally* flowing from an interior perception common to all men, of the true human form of God. Nor is our language so imperfect, but it will readily admit of the variation of your terms from the *masculine* to the *neuter* gender. Thus, if you really think, that God is neither male nor female, nor in any other shape than that of infinite space, you are at perfect liberty to speak of him in the following manner: 'God, *which* is invisible, sees and hears us wherever we are, and *its* power extends to all persons and things. Although *it* is invisible, yet *it* is the maker and constant preserver of all things.' *It* has commissioned various men to communicate *its* will to mankind, and *it* always sanctioned their missions by the power of working miracles,' &c. But I apprehend you would not venture to speak in such terms of any being possessed of common rationality; much less of Him who is the sole fountain and source of all wisdom. And yet, to be consistent with yourself as a philosopher and grammarian, acknowledging God under no form but that of infinite extension, which is undoubtedly *neuter*, you are certainly bound to adopt this new style of writing for the future. If, as you say, our giving to God the form of a man, be to make him a man, and nothing more; it follows by parity of reason, that your giving him the form of infinite space, is to make him infinite

space, and nothing more ; for, according to your own doctrine, whatever the form be, such is the true denomination of the substance or being, of which it is the form. In consequence of our acknowledging God as existing in a human form, we, in strict conformity to our principles, declare him actually to be a *Divine Man*. So you, in your turn, to shew your consistency, ought without reserve plainly to avow your belief, that God, being in the form of infinite space, is in fact nothing else but *infinite space* ; or, if you reason agreeably to your declaration in p. 50, you must naturally conclude, that as God cannot possibly have any form, so he cannot have any existence at all. Such are the consequences necessarily attendant on the false premises which you have chosen as the basis of your religion ; a scheme so visionary, and destitute of all rationality, that I wonder you are not ashamed of lending your name to its support.

The light of reason is of itself sufficient to overthrow your whole system : but if we come to examine your assertions by the Word of God, we shall find them no less opposed to the plain language of divine inspiration, than to the dictates of sound reason. You say, “should the form of a horse be given to a man, it would be nothing less than changing the man into a horse.” Now in Apoc. ix. 7, it is said, that “the *shapes* of the *locusts* were like unto horses prepared unto battle.” Here I would ask you, whether the locusts, in consequence of being in the form of horses, were real horses ; or whether they remained locusts still ? Again, the devil is represented as being in the form of a *dragon* or *serpent*, Apoc. xii. 3, 9. Is he therefore no more than a dragon or serpent ? And is the whole mode of his life thereby so changed, that he cannot perform any other functions, than such as are proper to a reptile of the earth ? So again, the seven churches were seen by John

in the form of seven *golden candlesticks*, Apoc. i. 12. Is the church therefore nothing more than a candlestick? Jesus Christ, whom you allow to be a man, is spoken of as appearing in the form of a *Lamb* standing upon mount Sion, Apoc. xiv. 1. Do you, on that account, consider him as having been actually transformed into a lamb? Again, the Spirit of God descended from heaven like a *dove*, and rested on Jesus, John i. 32. Will you therefore insist upon it, that the Spirit of God is no more than a dove? Lastly, you yourself have acknowledged, p. 30, that “the one true God, besides whom there is no other, is the *Word*.” Now the Word has made its appearance among men literally in the form of a book: from your own principles therefore it necessarily follows, that the one true God, who is the Word, is nothing else but a book. I should be very sorry to draw any unfair conclusions from the premises you lay down; but really, Sir, according to the best of my understanding I cannot help judging, that both your theological and philosophical systems are radically defective; and therefore, as I am myself in pursuit of truth, I hope I may be permitted, without offence, to inform my neighbours where it is *not* to be found. The traveller, who avoids the paths of error, cannot fail to take the right road.

Before I quit this subject, I find myself disposed to answer with seriousness a question, which you apparently put by way of ridicule. Your words are as follow: “Was the divine form *male* or *female*? Since the two sexes correspond to each other, he ought to be both, or neither.” To which you add, “Indeed, gentlemen, it is impossible to consider your opinions on serious subjects with perfect seriousness.” Now, Sir, if for a moment you will put away the smile that sits upon your countenance, I will endeavour to give you all the satisfaction in my power, by stating, in a few words, my reasons for considering the

great creator of the universe to be a *Male Man*, and not a female. But as every question relative to the Divine Being ought to be treated with all the reverence due to his holy name, I hope no expression that may drop from my pen, will give any just occasion of offence to the reader.

The distinguishing characteristic of a male is *activity*; while that of a female is *re-activity*. Thus God, as an *active* Creator, is properly *male*; and the whole creation, as a *re-active* subject, is properly *female*. In a more particular point of view, the Lord is the *Bridegroom*, and the church his *Bride*; or, to be still more explicit, primary love, which is a love that produces wisdom, is *masculine*, while secondary love, which is the love of that wisdom when produced, is *feminine*. The Lord, as to his proper person, is divine love or divine good, not however to the exclusion of wisdom or truth, but rather to its propagation; for divine truth is not so much *in* the Lord, as *proceeding from* the Lord, just as light is not *in* the body of the sun, but *proceeds from* the sun. Now as divine good, or primary love, constitutes the person of the Lord, while divine truth, together with its secondary love, is only a proceeding from the Lord, it follows, that the *male* principle essentially resides *in him*, and that the *female* principle commences *out of him*. Thus the human soul, although it came *from God*, and is also conjoined *to God*, yet being *out of God*, and consequently *female* in respect to God, is *not a part of God*. Hence I infer, that God, as Creator, Redeemer, and Regenerator, is truly and properly a *Divine Male Man*; and that the whole angelic heaven as created, redeemed, and regenerated, is truly and properly a *Grand Female Man*; or in other words, that the Lord God Jesus Christ is an *Husband*, who hath taken to himself, in celestial marriage, the church universal for his *Wife*.

To enter more fully into the discussion of this grand subject, perhaps may not be prudent in the present instance, as I know not how my readers may be affected with what has been already advanced. For my own part, such an investigation would be highly agreeable, and I think equally serviceable in assisting us to form just conceptions of the person and attributes of the Creator, and the necessary distinction between him and his creatures. But as I have neither time nor ability to do justice to the subject, I must leave all deficiencies to be supplied in the mind of the true spiritual philosopher. I may however just remark, that that must be a gross system of materialism indeed, which excludes from the Divine Being all form or personality whatever, and reduces to a state of mere *neutrality* that God, from whom both the *male* and *female* principles of humanity, with all their innumerable felicities, are continually derived.

To say, that love, wisdom, and life, have no relation to form, as you do p. 51, appears to me the same as if you had asserted, that sight has no relation to the eye, nor hearing to the ear; yet in both cases the faculty is inseparably united with its organ. But the sentiments you now express seem in direct opposition to the hypothesis laid down in your *Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit*. You there assert, vol. i. p. 48, “that the powers of sensation and thought are the *necessary result* of a particular *organization*” of the brain; that is, of a particular *form*. But here you ask, “What relation have wisdom, love, and life, to *form*?” and then add, “It resembles Addison’s apparition; which was in the shape of *the sound of a drum*.” Really, Sir, I cannot but think you have been ridiculing our system, at the expence of your own. If neither thought nor sensation can exist in man, without being connected with form, which is a doctrine you have taken great pains

to establish; how comes it to pass, that you should have so far forgotten your own principles, as to declare, that wisdom, love, and life, when predicated of the Divine Being, cannot possibly have any relation to form? Perhaps you will say, it is true of man, but not of God. I ask, How do you know this? Sound philosophers, I have ever understood, reason from and according to what they actually know. But here you draw conclusions plainly repugnant to your premises, and form a judgment in defiance of evidence.

In the aforesaid volume of your *Disquisitions on Matter and Spirit*, throughout, particularly in p. 177, 182, 185, your avowed sentiments are, that God is subject to extension, that he has properties in common with matter, that he bears relation to space, and lastly, that he is himself absolutely *material*. Now all matter is form; it follows therefore from your own principles, that God, if he be material, must also have a form; for as an individual atom cannot exist without its particular form, so neither can the universal bulk of matter, of which the individual atom is a part, exist without its form. And God, you say, is extended through all matter, insomuch that he is in all respects material, having nothing of immateriality about him; wherefore it again follows, according to your hypothesis, that God is in the exact form of the universal bulk of matter. If you suppose matter to be infinitely extended, then you also allow God to be infinitely extended along with it. But if your scheme admits of a limitation to the extension of matter, then God himself must be limited to that form, be it what it may; for such is the necessary consequence of ascribing to God a material existence, or allowing him no properties but such as are inseparably connected with matter.

As to the shape of the sound of a drum, to which you

pleasantly enough resemble the form of wisdom, love, and life; give me leave to observe, that by such a comparison you only expose your own principles, and furnish me with an additional occasion of pointing out their absurdity. The sound of a drum, you know, is propagated in all directions from the centre of percussion. Consequently its shape can be no other than that of a circle or globe, the nearest resemblance of infinite space, among all the forms with which we are acquainted. Now you have already acknowledged, that God, if he has any form at all, must be in the form of infinite space; therefore I have a right to turn the tables upon you, and say, that the God, whom Dr. Priestley worships, exactly “resembles Addison’s apparition, which was *in the shape of the sound of a drum.*”

But waving these considerations, let me seriously hope, that you will re-examine your peculiar tenets, and on pure conviction be led to adopt a more rational system of religion; a system that can present to your view a God arrayed in all the glory of a Divine Human Form, and as such visible, accessible, and in some sort comprehensible by his finite creatures; a system that represents God as the mild and gracious *Father* of the human race, rejoicing in their joy, and sympathizing with them in their sorrows, from those *bowels* of infinite mercy and compassion, which are alone predicable of a *Divine Humanity*, and *Human Divinity*. You will then perceive the true import of those words in John’s Gospel, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was the Word. And the Word was made *Flesh*, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth,” John i. 1, 14.

* * *

III. *Of the Union of Divinity and Humanity in the Person of Jesus Christ, and at the same time of the Divine Omnipotence.*

It may naturally be expected, that the person, who denies the possibility of the Divine Being assuming to himself a human form, will object likewise to the means whereby such an event was accomplished. Accordingly in p. 34, you take occasion to remark, “that of what kind soever was the union that was to be formed between the divine essence and the human body, and whatever purpose it was intended to answer, it is extraordinary that he who is omnipotent and who made all things by a word speaking, should not have effected this union but in a course of time; and Swedenborg gives us no assistance whatever in forming any idea of the manner in which trials or temptations promoted this union, or why one degree of union (if there be such degrees) might not have answered the purpose as well as another. But, admitting all this, why different modes of speaking should be adopted by our Saviour in the different stages of this union, is particularly incomprehensible, since in all the cases, both the person speaking, and the person spoken to, must have been the very same, the divine mind.”

I have already explained, in a preceding part of this *Defence of the New Church*, how the person speaking, and the person spoken to, may with propriety be said to be one and the same. It is therefore unnecessary to repeat what was there advanced, or even to add any thing further on the same subject; for if the principle, on which I reasoned be just, it will of itself be sufficient to clear up all the apparent difficulties respecting the different modes of speaking, which our Lord adopted during the different stages of his union with the Father; but if, on the contrary, the truth of my observations be not admitted, any further reasoning on the same principle would be needless and superfluous.

You seem to think it an extraordinary thing that such union, if it ever took place, was not effected instantaneously, but gradually. But herein you only discover how crude and indigested your ideas of the divine omnipotence are; imagining no doubt, that God, because he is omnipotent, can do whatever is proposed, even though the proposition should imply a breach of divine order. This, indeed, is the common belief of the present day, from whence have arisen so many phantasies respecting the power of God, as, that he created the universe out of nothing merely “by a word speaking;” and that this creation was effected in an instant; that God, by virtue of his omnipotence, is able to save all the human race, nay even to turn devils into angels, and hell into heaven; that man cannot live after death, until the soul is re-united to the body, and again endued with its external senses; and that the material body, although devoured by worms and fish, and in a variety of forms entering into the constitution of other bodies, will by a sovereign act of divine omnipotence be again raised and collected together, at the supposed time of the general judgment, when the visible heavens and the whole habitable earth are to pass away and perish. These and many other groundless notions about the divine omnipotence are in general circulation both among the learned and the simple; few being able to see, that the power of God is bounded by the laws of his own order, which cannot be transgressed even by omnipotence itself; because this would imply, that God, who is essential order, could go out of himself, and thereby act contrary to himself, which is a manifest absurdity.

Of all such as entertain an idea of God’s absolute, unlimited power, and who suppose that the universe was created by the mere utterance of a word, I would ask, 1. Why was the omnipotent hand of God employed

six* days in arranging the work of creation, when “a word speaking” could as completely and as instantaneously have brought it to its present order, as originally called it into being? 2. Why did not God, on the creation of man, immediately place him in heaven, without laying him under the necessity of first passing through this present state of probation? particularly as it is his desire, that all men should be saved, and be happy for ever? 3. If he needs must place him in this natural world, why has he ordained, that he shall pass so many years in a state of helpless infancy, before he can possibly have any true knowledge of him as his Creator and adorable Benefactor? 4. Why has not God, by his omnipotence, established one true religion over the whole earth? And why has he permitted so many heresies to distract the christian world in particular? 5. Why did he not send the Messiah into the world immediately after the fall, in order to recover man from the lost state into which he had plunged himself, without waiting for the lapse of so many ages; when from the beginning he foresaw that wickedness would increase on the earth, and that all the endeavours of his prophets, forerunners of the Messiah, would be ineffectual to reclaim the world? 6. Why does not God miraculously and irresistibly compel every rational being to acknowledge him alone as the sovereign of the universe, and by a sudden interposition of divine authority at once put an end to the present controversy, and remove every possible doubt from every human mind with respect to the true and proper divinity of Jesus Christ? These, and a great variety of other questions of a similar nature, will be found extremely difficult to be answered by any person who imagines, that the divine omnipotence has

* The creation spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis, does not at all allude to the creation of the visible universe, but solely to the regeneration of man, as may be seen abundantly proved by Emanuel Swedenborg in his *Arcana Coelestia*.

no bounds or limits, but that it can be equally exerted in the performance of what is contrary to order, as of what is agreeable to order. All these things, however, are easily accounted for, when we know the laws of divine order, within and according to which every act of omnipotence must necessarily be confined and determined. The reason why the angels of heaven so far excel the spirits of hell in respect to power, is because the former act agreeably to order, while the latter are in opposition to it; and in proportion to their love of, and agreement with order, such invariably is their power. Were they to depart from order, their power would depart from them at the same time. Just so, God, being infinite and essential order, is in consequence thereof possessed of infinite and essential power. Were he in any measure to depart from his own order, he would in the same proportion immediately lose his omnipotence. But as to depart from order would be the same thing as to depart from himself, it is evident, that the divine omnipotence can perform nothing but what is consistent with the laws of order, and that every supposition to the contrary is both irrational and absurd.

With respect to the union of the divine essence with the human, which you object against not only in point of fact, but also as to the manner of its completion, in that it is stated to have been gradual and not instantaneous, the following passages from the Word will be sufficient to establish the truth of the proposition. “The child (Jesus) *grew and waxed strong in spirit*, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him. And Jesus *increased* in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man,” Luke ii. 40, 52. Jesus said, “Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, *I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again*,” John xii. 28. “When Judas was gone out, Jesus said, *Now is the Son of Man glorified*,

and *God is glorified in him*. If *God be glorified in him, God shall also glorify him in himself, and shall straightway glorify him,*" John xiii. 31, 32. Hence it is plain, that the union of the Humanity and the Divinity, which by the evangelists is called *glorification*, was not effected all at once, but by degrees; and that it became more and more perfect by means of temptations or sufferings which the Lord underwent during his continuance upon earth, until by the passion of the cross it was perfectly completed. Wherefore the Lord, after his resurrection, saith, "Ought not Christ to have *suffered* these things, and to enter into *his glory*?" Luke xxiv. 26.

But you object, p. 35, "It happens unfortunately for your hypothesis, that when Christ spake of the Father as being *one with himself*, it was at a period prior to his last sufferings, by which you say this union was completed." To which I answer, His last suffering was indeed the last act of glorification in this world; but as the union of Humanity and Divinity was gradually effected, in every stage of his sufferings, the Lord was *so far* one with the Father, as that union was promoted, and *no farther*. This is the sense in which we uniformly understand the Lord's words prior to his last sufferings: but after his resurrection he says, "*All power* is given unto me in heaven and in earth," Matt. xxviii. 18; plainly implying, that a full union had taken place between his divine and human nature. It may not, however, be amiss here to remark, that as the gospels were written a considerable time after the Lord's full glorification and ascension, consequently at a time when he was perfectly one with the Father, the terms of inspiration are occasionally such as to have some respect to that circumstance, as well as to the gradual process of the glorification under an historical point of view; and it is not unusual for

the precision of the literal sense to give way to the spiritual sense, which is within or above it. Two or three remarkable instances of this kind may be seen in the note below.*

* 1. It is said, Exod. xii. 40, that "the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." But according to the scripture chronology they were in Egypt no more than 215 years, which is only half of the time stated in the above passage; for Moses sprang from Amram, Amram from Kohath, and Kohath from Levi, and Kohath went with his father Levi into Egypt, Gen. xlii. 11. Now the age of Kohath was 133 years, Exod. vi. 18; the age of Amram 137 years, verse 20; and the age of Moses when he stood before Pharaoh, 80 years, Exod. vii. 7. All these years added together make only 350, which are considerably short of 430; and therefore it is impossible the children of Israel could have been 430 years in Egypt. No mention is made how old Kohath was when Amram was born, nor how old Amram was when Moses was born; but in all probability they were advanced in years. If we suppose them to have been about the age of 67, and for both their ages deduct 135 from 350, it will leave 215, the real number of years the Israelites sojourned in Egypt, according to the chronology of the scriptures. This variation from the historical truth of the fact, is on account of the internal sense, which requires the number 430 as it's proper correspondent expression, and not 215, although this latter would have been more strictly conformable to the literal transaction. But as in the spiritual world there is neither time nor space, and the Word of God is written as well for the use of angels and spirits, as of men; therefore the literal sense, which is *in* time and space, occasionally gives way to the spiritual sense, which is *above* time and space, just as a servant or inferior gives way to his master or superior.

2. Another instance, wherein the literal sense of the Word diverges from the strictness of historical fact, by way of submission to its spiritual sense, is the following in Matt. xxvii. 9, 10, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by *Jeremy* the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me." Now this passage is not to be found in *Jeremiah*, but in *Zechariah*, chap. xi. 12, 13; yet so far is this circumstance from invalidating the authority of Matthew's gospel, that, when properly understood, it rather furnishes a proof of the evangelist's divine inspiration, as I have already shewn in the *Magazine of Knowledge*, &c. vol. 1 p. 451; the substance of which explanation I shall here transcribe. It is to be observed, that all the prophets represent the Word, or doctrine drawn from the Word, or the state of the church as to it's reception of the Word. Consequently every particular prophet represents some specific doctrine taught by the Word, and deducible therefrom. Thus the prophet Jeremiah represents the doctrine of the Word, which treats of the rejection of the Lord by the Jews, and the vastation of the church; and this not only in the particular prophecy which bears his name, but in *every other book of the Word* where that is the subject treated of. Hence it is, that Matthew, being under the burden of divine inspiration, when he would quote that part of the Word, which points out the low estimation in which the children of Israel valued the Lord, (signified by the thirty pieces of silver given for the potter's field,) brings forward a passage to that purport from *Zechariah*, and says, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by *Jeremy* the prophet;" for *that doctrine is the prophet Jeremy* wherever it occurs throughout the Word, whether it be, according to the letter, in Isaiah, or in Jeremiah, or in Ezekiel, or in Daniel, or in Zechariah, or in any other of the prophets. In like manner *Moses* means all the historical part of the Word, and *Elias* all the prophetic part.

I am sensible that while you deny the fact of the Lord's glorification, or union with the Divinity, it will be to little purpose to explain the mode of its accomplishment. However, as you have thought proper to state your objections to the manner, as well as to the thing itself, I must beg leave to add a few more observations on this very important subject.

All temptation arises from a disagreement between the internal and external man, and is permitted for the purpose of promoting their union. But this union cannot be effected, unless the satisfactions or delights of the external man, which are in opposition to the delights of the internal man, be resisted, overcome, and removed. Now as it is impossible for those delights to be resisted, except during the moments of their excitation; therefore, by the Divine Providence of the Lord, which operates for the sake of salvation, they are permitted occasionally to affect every man, who has entered upon a state of regeneration. He who is influenced by the love of what is good and true, will not at such times suffer himself to be seduced by the delights of the senses; but throwing them as it were behind his back, he breaks the force of habitual evil, and by degrees elevates his mind to pleasures of a more rational and spiritual nature, into the full enjoyment of which he at length enters. This comparison may help to give a faint idea how and in what manner the Lord's Humanity and Divinity were united by means of repeated temptations, trials, or conflicts, with the powers of hell: for as the regeneration of man is an image of the

3. Of the many other instances of a similar nature to be found in the Scriptures. I shall only adduce a third. In Gen. xiv. 14. 16. Lot is called the brother of Abram, although in reality he was Abram's brother's son, as may be seen in verse 12 of the same chapter. This likewise was for the sake of the internal sense which required that Lot should first be considered as the nephew of Abram, and afterwards as his brother. Had it been expressed otherwise the series of the internal sense would have been interrupted, which is yet more necessary to be observed than that of the literal sense.

Lord's glorification, or union with the Divinity, so the orderly accomplishment of the one marks out the gradual process of the other.

It is an undoubted truth, that the Lord could not be tempted as to his divinity; for it is impossible that the powers of hell should assault what is divine. For which reason, and that he might put himself into a capacity of fighting against them as it were *upon their own ground*, he was pleased to assume the human nature by actual birth, from a virgin; which human nature, so received from a woman, was such that it might be tempted, suffer hunger and thirst, and lastly die. To this Humanity adhered the evils not only of Mary his mother, but of the whole human race; in consequence of which his temptations were more terrible and grievous than those of any other man; for singly and by his own power he fought against, and overcame all hell. This is expressed by Isaiah in the following terms: "Surely he hath *borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows*: he was wounded *for our transgressions*, he was bruised *for our iniquities*: the chastisement of *our peace* was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. Jehovah hath laid on him *the iniquity of us all*: for the *transgression of my people* was he stricken," Isaiah liii. 4, 5, 6, 8. Without an adherence of evil it would have been impossible for the Lord to be tempted at all; for evil is that by which temptation comes, and which at such times is excited by the approach of infernal spirits. With the Lord, however, let it be well remarked, *there was no actual or proper evil*, as there is with all men, but *only hereditary evil* from the mother; and even this hereditary evil, which is barely an inclination or incitement to evil, the Lord also afterwards completely exterminated from his Humanity, insomuch that he is now no longer in any wise the son of Mary, there not being in him the smallest particle of dust, or any thing else

derived from her. So that, as from the beginning he was never the son of Joseph, Matt. i. 25, Luke ii. 49, in like manner after the crucifixion he was not the son of Mary, according to his own words in John xix. 26, 27.

There is therefore a great distinction to be made between the Humanity derived from Mary, and the Humanity derived from Jehovah. The former Humanity had an adherence of hereditary evil, and was capable of being tempted and of suffering death: but the latter, which is properly the Divine Humanity, was, like the pure Divinity itself, ever incapable of both. The Humanity from Mary was *infirm*, like that of any other man, Ps. lxxvii. 10: but the Humanity from Jehovah was *omnipotent*, being the very *arm of Jehovah*, Isaiah liii. 1. The Humanity from Mary was *put off*: but the Humanity from Jehovah was *put on*. The Humanity from Mary was a *receptacle of life*: but the Humanity from Jehovah was, like the Divinity, *life itself*, John v. 26. chap. vi. 48. chap. xi. 25. chap. xiv. 6. The Humanity from Mary was forty days in the wilderness *tempted of the devil*, who *carried him about*, *placed him* on the pinnacle of the temple, and *took him* to an exceeding high mountain: but the Humanity from Jehovah, when Jesus *took himself* into an high mountain, and was there transfigured before Peter, James, and John, did shine as the sun in its brightness. Such was the appearance of his face; and as to his raiment, it was white as the light, Matt. xv. 1, 2. The same Humanity from Jehovah, so far from being tempted or assaulted by devils, *put them* to instant consternation and flight; “and they cried out, saying, *What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?*” Matt. viii. 29, Luke iv. 41, chap. viii. 28. Again, the Humanity from Mary was *material*, and as such, subject to the laws of material visibility, tangibility, gravity, and locality; wit-

ness his apprehension, crucifixion, and burial. But the Humanity from Jehovah is *not material*, but *substantial*, and as such, incapable of being seen by a material eye. or touched by a material hand; neither is he subject to any laws of gravity or locality, but is *omnipresent* with his Humanity as well as his Divinity.

In proof of these assertions, I need only bring the following passages from the New Testament. That the Humanity of Jesus, after his resurrection, was *not material*, is plain from John xx. 19, where it is said, that Jesus came and stood in the midst of his disciples, *when the doors were shut*. That his Humanity is nevertheless *substantial*, is declared in these words: Jesus said, “Behold *my hands* and *my feet*, that it is I myself: *handle me*, and see; for a spirit hath not *flesh and bones*, as ye see *me have*,” Luke xxiv. 39. He also took a piece of broiled fish, and of an honeycomb, and *did eat* before them, verse 42, 43, of the same chapter.

That the Divine Humanity of the Lord is *incapable of being seen* by a material eye, is proved from this circumstance, that his apostles, even before his crucifixion, could not see it, except when they were in the spirit; as at the time of the transfiguration before Peter, James, and John, they could not see his glorified body until their spiritual eyes were opened: for it is said, “As he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistering. But Peter, and they that were with him, were *heavy with sleep*: and *when they were awake*, they saw *his glory*, and the two men that stood with him,” Luke ix. 29, 32. Their being heavy with sleep, and afterwards waking, denotes their change from a natural state to a spiritual one; for the life of the body, with all its external sensations, compared to the life of the spirit, is like a state of sleep compared to a state of wakefulness. But that the

Divine Humanity is incapable of being seen by a material eye, is further evident from the circumstance of the Lord's being invisible to all after his resurrection, except to those whose spiritual eyes were first opened for the express purpose of beholding him : wherefore it is written, that "*their eyes were opened, and they knew him ; and he vanished out of their sight,*" Luke xxiv. 31. The case was the same with the women who visited his sepulchre after his resurrection, and saw two angels, whom it was impossible to see with the material eye, but with the eyes of their spirit only ; for it is a true maxim, That *like only can see it's like*.

That the Divine Humanity cannot be *touched* by a material hand, is a consequence of it's not being material, but substantial, as already proved. A material hand can touch nothing but what may equally as well be touched or obstructed by material doors and walls. But Jesus entered among his disciples when the doors were shut : therefore as his glorified body had no relation to the materiality of a door, so neither can it have any relation to the materiality of an hand. Whence it follows, that the Divine Humanity is not tangible by material hands. It may possibly be objected, ' Did not Jesus himself say to his disciples, "*Handle me, and see ;*" and to Thomas in particular, "*Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands ; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side ?*" ' I answer, He did so ; but not till the disciples and Thomas were in the spirit ; and a spiritual eye, and a spiritual hand, can see and touch a spiritual or substantial body, but a material eye and hand cannot.

That the Divine Humanity is *not subject to the laws of gravity*, is evident both from his resurrection out of the grave, and from his ascension into heaven. Concerning his ascension it is thus written : " And it came to pass, while

he blessed them, he was parted from them, and *carried up into heaven*," Luke xxiv. 51. Now no material body ever did or can ascend to heaven; but the divine body that came down from heaven, that alone hath returned back to heaven. The circumstance of Enoch and Elijah being translated to heaven, is not to be understood literally, but spiritually; for our Lord says, "*No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven*," John iii. 13.

Lastly, That the Divine Humanity is *omnipresent*, may not only be gathered from the passage in John last quoted, where it is said, that the Son of Man, even while on earth, was still in heaven, but also from the following words, which Jesus uttered immediately before his ascension: "*Lo, I am with you always* even unto the consummation of the age," Matt. xxviii. 20. It also appears from the promise which the Lord made to his disciples, that on his leaving them he would send the comforter to abide with them for ever; which Comforter or Spirit of Truth, he at the same time give them to understand, was no other than himself: "*I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you*," John xiv. 18. From which it is plain, that although the Lord hath ascended up into heaven, yet he is still upon earth; consequently that his Divine Humanity is omnipresent.

Such is the doctrine of the New Church concerning the Divine Humanity, and its distinction from the infirm humanity derived from Mary; the former being the object of our worship, and not the latter. All therefore that you have said in p. 63, about the union of an infirm human body to the divine nature, and the necessity of its impeding, instead of facilitating the divine operations, as it does not apply to our doctrines, when rightly understood, falls to the ground of its own accord, and loses itself among those

numerous other objections, which are frequently started by persons who have not made themselves masters of the subject.

To be well acquainted with the doctrines of the New Church, particularly in respect to the glorification of the Lord's Humanity, it is necessary to study Swedenborg's *Arcana Cœlestia* with great attention; for therein not only the fact itself is clearly demonstrated, but the reasons are also stated why such a process was inseparable from the work of redemption. I shall here only quote the following passages respecting the infirm humanity which the Lord derived from Mary. "The Lord," says he, *Arc. Cœl.* n. 1414, "was as another man in every respect but as he was conceived of Jehovah; nevertheless he was born of a woman, a virgin, and consequently by his nativity contracted infirmities from the virgin mother, such as are common to other men; which infirmities were corporeal. There are two hereditary principles connate in man, one derived from the father, the other from the mother; the hereditary principle of the Lord derived from the Father was divine, but that from the mother was an infirm humanity. This infirm part or principle, which man deriveth hereditarily from the mother, is somewhat corporeal, which is dispersed during regeneration; but what man deriveth from the Father, remaineth to eternity." And again, explaining Gen. xiii. 7, where it is said, that the Canaanite and Perizzite were then in the land, by whom are understood evils and falses in the Lord's external man, he adds, n. 1573, "It may be matter of surprize to many to hear speak of hereditary evil from the mother being with the Lord; but whereas it is here declared so manifestly, and the subject treated of in an internal sense is concerning the Lord, there can be no reason at all to doubt its being so. For it is altogether impossible for one man to be born of another man, but he

must thence derive evil: nevertheless there is a difference between hereditary evil which is derived from the father, and that which is derived from the mother; hereditary evil from the father is of a more interior nature, and remaineth to eternity, for it cannot by any means be eradicated. The Lord, however, had no such evil appertaining to him, inasmuch as he was born of the Father Jehovah, and was thus divine or Jehovah as to his internals: but hereditary evil from the mother appertaineth to the external man, and this evil was with the Lord, and is called the Canaanite in the land, the false then derived being called the Perizzite. Thus the Lord was born as another man, and had infirmities as another man. That he derived hereditary evil from the mother, appears evidently from the circumstance of his enduring temptations; for it is impossible that any one should be tempted who hath no evil, evil being that in man which tempteth, and by which he is tempted. That the Lord was tempted, and that he endured a thousand times more grievous temptations than any man can possibly endure, and that he endured them singly, and by his own proper power overcame evil, or the devil and all hell, is also manifest; concerning these temptations it is thus written in Luke, "Jesus was led in the spirit into the wilderness, being forty days tempted of the devil, so that he did not eat in those days; but when the devil had finished all the temptation, he desisted from him for a time; thence Jesus returned in the power of the spirit into Galilee," iv. 1, 2, 13, 14: and in Mark, "The spirit driving Jesus caused him to go forth into the wilderness, and he was in the wilderness forty days being tempted, and was with the wild beasts," i. 12, 13; where by wild beasts is signified hell; not to mention further, that he was tempted even unto death, so that his sweat was drops of blood: "And being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was as

drops of blood falling to the ground," Luke xxii. 44. It is not possible for any angel to be tempted by the devil, because whilst he is in the Lord, the evil spirits cannot approach him even distantly, being instantly seized with horror and fright; much less could hell approach to the Lord, if he had been born divine, that is, without an adherence of evil from the mother. That the Lord also bore the iniquities and evils of mankind, is a form of speaking commonly used in the pulpit; but to derive iniquities and evils upon himself, was impossible, except in an hereditary way from his mother. The divine nature or principle is not susceptible of evil; wherefore that he might overcome evil by his own proper strength, which no man ever could, or can do, and might thus alone become righteousness, he was willing to be born as another man; otherwise there would have been no need that he should be born; for he might have assumed the human essence without nativity, as he also did assume it occasionally, when he appeared to the most ancient church, and likewise to the prophets. But he came into the world for this reason, that he might also put on evil, in order to fight against and overcome it, and might thus join together in himself the divine essence and the human essence. The Lord however had no actual or proper evil, as he himself declareth in John, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" viii. 46.

Before I close this subject, I will just add a short remark on the forty days which passed between our Lord's resurrection and ascension into heaven. After quoting an explanation of that circumstance from the *Magazine of Knowledge*, vol. i. p. 277, wherein, among other things, the reason is stated to be, because the number *forty* corresponds to temptations, you say, p. 36, "What authority this writer had for this ingenious speculation, does not appear. But a much more obvious use of Jesus continuing

on earth these forty days, and one that is plainly indicated in the scriptures, was, that time might be given for a sufficient number of successive appearances to the disciples, in order to give them the most complete satisfaction concerning the resurrection of their master." The *ingenious speculation*, as you are pleased to call it, having flowed from my pen, it may not be improper to inform you from what authority I derived it. After stating that the spiritual reason why the Lord's ascension was protracted till forty days after his resurrection, was because the number forty corresponds to temptations, and signifies complete deliverance therefrom, and victory over all enemies, thus a plenary state of glorification; I asserted, that the Lord ascended above all the heavens into the sun of the spiritual world, in the midst whereof he eternally resides, as Jehovah God, in glorious human form. As you do not agree with me in admitting the testimony of Swedenborg on this matter, I shall produce such other authority as I hope you have no objection to acknowledge. David says, "God is *gone up* with a shout, Jehovah with the sound of a trumpet," Psalm xlvii. 5. "Thou hast *ascended on high*, thou hast led captivity captive," Psalm lxviii. 18. And Paul, alluding to the last cited passage, says, "He that descended is the same also that *ascended up far above all heavens*, that he might fill all things," Eph. iv. 10. And further, he calls our Lord Jesus Christ "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling *in the light which no man can approach unto*," 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. This inaccessible light, in which Jesus dwells, can surely be no other than the sun of the spiritual world. But to make it more evident still, John, in the Apocalypse, expressly says, "I saw *an angel standing in the sun*," Apoc. xix. 17. Now it is not possible for any angel to stand in the sun of the spiritual world; for

that sun is spiritual fire, the intensity of which is so great, that were any finite creature to approximate too near it, he would instantly be consumed, in like manner as would a man, were he to approach the sun of the natural world, which is elementary fire. Wherefore it follows, that the angel, whom John saw standing in the sun of the spiritual world, could be no other than Jehovah God himself, who in Psalm lxxxiv. 11, is even called a *Sun*. Again, "O Jehovah our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory *above the heavens*," Psalm viii. 1. "Be thou exalted, O God, *above the heavens*; thy glory above all the earth," Psalm lvii. 5, 11. "Jehovah is high above all nations, his glory *above the heavens*. Who is like unto Jehovah our God, who dwelleth *on high*? Who *humbleth himself* to behold the things that are *in heaven*," Psalm cxiii. 4, 5, 6. From all these passages it appears, that the Lord's most immediate and personal residence is far above all the heavens, and consequently in the sun of the spiritual world, which is the proximate sphere of his divine emanation.

With respect to the number *forty* signifying a plenary state of temptations from beginning to end, this is plain from all those passages of the Word where that number occurs; as where it is said, that the flood continued *forty* days upon the earth; that Moses abode *forty* days upon mount Sinai; that the children of Israel sojourned *forty* years in the wilderness; and that the Lord was tempted by the devil *forty* days in the wilderness. But you say, a much more obvious use of Jesus continuing on earth forty days after his resurrection, was, that time might be given for a sufficient number of successive appearances to the disciples, in order to convince them he was risen. Now it appears from the gospels, that the Lord was seen only a few times by his disciples: therefore it is evident, that the protraction of his ascension for forty days, could not be merely for the reason which you

assign; for three or four days only would have been sufficient for the purpose you mention, without waiting forty. His last appearance to his disciples, as recorded in Luke and John, is by the latter declared to be “the *third* time that Jesus shewed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead,” John xxi. 14. There must therefore have been some other secret and particular reason why the Lord did not ascend till forty days after his resurrection; and I know of none more likely to be the true one, than that already offered, as coinciding so perfectly with other parts of the sacred scripture, where the number *forty* is used.

* * *

IV. *Of the Holy Scripture and the Science of Correspondences.*

One of the objections, which you bring against the members of the New Jerusalem is, that they believe the holy scriptures contain a spiritual sense, different from, though concealed under, the sense of the letter. But it is your opinion, that there is no such sense; for you say, p. 17, “As to any spiritual sense of the scriptures, *it cannot be attended to*, till there be some evidence of the reality of such a sense of them.” And again, p. 57, “The sacred writers are far from saying that they had any other meaning than that which appears *on the face of their writings*, and which is to be found in the *customary sense of their words*;* and if other senses be once admitted, there is no end of diversity

* This passage reminds me of a little anecdote, which I will here subjoin. Some time ago, a person was relating to me, that a letter was sent to a distant friend by his Majesty’s sloop the *Bull-Dog*. A child about seven years of age was present, and as I afterwards found, was struck with astonishment at the discourse; for immediately on the person’s retiring, the child with great simplicity said to me, “What, papa, can a *bull-dog* carry a letter for any one?” I told him, that the *Bull-Dog* we had been speaking about, was not a *dog*, but a *ship*, so called to distinguish it from other ships. It then occurred to me, how common it was for mankind, as it were by general consent, to adopt such kind of language, and to convey in their discourse ideas very different from the first or *customary sense of their words*.

of opinion. Different persons interpret even the literal sense differently. What then will be the case, if, besides this literal sense, there be another concealed one, with respect to which every person will, of course, think himself at liberty to form his own conjectures?" From this and other passages of your *Letters* it is very plainly to be seen, that you have not sufficiently informed yourself of what Swedenborg advances with respect to the spiritual sense of the Word. You seem to think it is a mere *arbitrary* meaning put upon words, without any *certain rule* to determine their signification. In this, however, you are greatly mistaken; and therefore all you have said about the uncertainty of the spiritual sense, is no better than breath spent in the air. Perhaps you have yet to be informed, that the *science of correspondences* is now discovered, which is the only true key that can unlock the cabinet of the literal sense of scripture, within which are contained the jewels of its spiritual and celestial sense. The great diversity of opinions respecting the letter, of which you are sufficiently apprized, is in a great measure owing to the want of such a key; for the more we are acquainted with the science of correspondences, so much the more shall we be agreed in judgment, and in the true understanding of the scriptures. Indeed so regular and certain is that science, that were any given number of persons, properly acquainted with it, required to give their opinion of any part of scripture, they would all uniformly agree in the same explanation, if not in words, yet in substance; which is a circumstance not even pretended to by those who reject the spiritual sense, but at the same time a striking proof of the reality of correspondences, and that the Word of God is written according to that science.

It is a well-known fact, that the sacred writings abound with parables. The prophets make frequent use of them; and of our Saviour it is said, that "without a parable spake

he not," Mark iv. 34. Now the sense of a parable is not that which appears on the face of it, nor is it to be understood according to the customary sense of the words; but it conveys, in many cases, a very different meaning. Paul likewise informs us, that the history of Abraham and his two sons, Ishmael and Isaac, is an allegory, Gal, iv. 24: and in the same chapter he explains what is meant by it; shewing, that it was representative of the two dispensations of the law and the gospel.

That the Word of God, in many instances, cannot possibly be understood according to the sense of the letter, may appear evident from the following passages.

1. In the prophecy of Israel it is said of Dan, "Dan shall be a *serpent* on the way, a *darting-serpent* on the path, biting the heels of the *horse*, and his rider shall fall backwards," Gen xlix. 17, 18. It is impossible for any one to understand the meaning of this prophecy without some knowledge of the science of correspondences, which teaches what is meant by a serpent, and what by a horse and his rider.

2. The prophet Habakkuk says to God, "Thou didst ride upon *thine horses*, thy *chariots* of salvation: thou didst walk through the sea with *thine horses*," Hab. iii. 8, 15. Here again the science of correspondences only can inform us what is meant by the horses of God, and by his riding upon them through the sea. The mere literal sense gives us no satisfaction at all.

3. "In that day, saith Jehovah, I will smite every *horse* with astonishment, and his rider with madness; and I will open mine eyes upon the house of Judah, and will smite every *horse of the people* with blindness," Zech. xii. 4. Without a spiritual sense, what can be meant by smiting every horse with astonishment, and the horse of the people with blindness?

4. When Elisha saw Elijah carried up by a whirlwind into heaven, he cried out to him, "My father, my father, the *chariot* of Israel, and the *horsemen* thereof," 2 Kings ii. 12. Joash the king also said to Elisha, "O my father, my father, the *chariot* of Israel, and the *horsemen* thereof," 2 Kings xiii. 14. Here both Elijah and Elisha are called the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof, which, if taken "according to the customary sense of the words," would be ridiculous and absurd.

5. "And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the *fowls* that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together to the *supper of the great God*; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great," Apoc. xix. 17, 18. This is another passage that cannot by any means be taken in the literal sense; and therefore it must be plain to every unprejudiced mind, notwithstanding your assertion to the contrary, that the sacred writers had some other meaning than that which appears on the face of their writings.

6. "Thou shalt suck the milk of the gentiles, and shalt suck the *breast of kings*, and thou shalt know that I Jehovah am thy Saviour, and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob," Isaiah lx. 16. Here mention is made of sucking the breast of kings; which in the literal sense must appear strange and unaccountable, but in the spiritual sense is beautiful beyond description.

7. "My well-beloved hath a vineyard *in the horn of a son of oil*," Isaiah v. 1. This is the proper translation of the original Hebrew, though in our common bibles it is rendered "My beloved hath a vineyard *in a very fruitful hill*." But taking the passage as it really is, what can be

made of a vineyard in the horn of a son of oil, if we confine ourselves to the mere literal sense of the expressions ?

8. “ The city (New Jerusalem) lieth four-square, and the length is as large as the breadth : and he measured the city with the reed, *twelve thousand furlongs* : the length, and the breadth, and the height of it are equal,” Apoc. xxi. 16. If this description be understood literally, the city must be no less than *fifteen hundred miles* in square dimensions. But on what spot of ground can such a city as this descend ? Not on this island, for it is not large enough to contain the half of its base. And although the height of the city is represented as fifteen hundred miles ; yet its wall is only an hundred and forty-four cubits, (216 feet,) which is likewise said to be according to the measure of a man, or an angel. Such are the difficulties attendant on the mere literal construction of the scriptures, which, however, do not in the least incumber their spiritual sense.

A great variety of other passages might be produced from the sacred writings, of which we can form no just idea, without having recourse to a different signification of the words from that which they usually bear. But the above are sufficient to prove the fact : and it only requires a proper knowledge of the science of correspondences, to be possessed of a rational, satisfactory, and determinate manner of explaining them. For example, wherever mention is made of a *horse*, it invariably signifies the *understanding* ; and a *chariot* means *doctrine*. Hence God is said to ride on a horse, and in a chariot, when he communicates to man an understanding to understand the doctrine of his Word : and hence to smite every horse with astonishment, and every horse of the people with blindness, denotes that there is no longer in the church the understanding of truth. The reason why Elijah and Elisha were called the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof, is because each represented the

Lord as to the Word ; and by chariot is signified doctrine drawn from the Word, and by horsemen intelligence. To this I shall take the liberty of adding a further remark of Swedenborg, in explanation of the same subject.

“ That such was the signification of chariot and horse, was perfectly well known in the ancient churches, for those churches were representative churches, and with the people thereof the science of correspondences and representations was the chief of all sciences. From those churches the signification of horse, as expressive of the understanding, was derived to the wise men round about, even to Greece. Hence it was, when they would describe the sun, in which they placed the God of their wisdom and intelligence, that they attributed to it a chariot and four horses of fire : and when they would describe the God of the sea, since by the sea were signified sciences derived from the understanding, that they also attributed horses to him. And when they would describe the rise of the sciences from understanding, that they also feigned a winged horse, which with its hoof broke open a fountain, at which were nine virgins called the sciences ; for from the ancient churches they received this knowledge, that by horse is signified the understanding, by wings spiritual truth, by hoof what is scientific from the understanding, and by fountain doctrine from which sciences are derived. Nor is any thing else signified by the Trojan horse, than artifice or cunning exercised by their understanding in destroying the walls. Indeed, in our day, when the understanding is described after the manner received from those ancients, it is usual to figure it by a flying horse or Pegasus ; so likewise doctrine is described by a fountain, and the sciences by virgins ; but scarce any one knows, that by horse in the mystic sense is signified the understanding ; still less that those significatives were derived from the ancient representative churches to the gentiles.” *Treatise on the White Horse*, n. 4

You further object against the same great author, p. 57, that “ he finds Christ in every passage of the Scriptures, even those in which before him they who made the most of the doctrine of types, never suspected any such reference.” This is certainly one of the truest charges you have brought against him, and forms a striking contrast between his doctrine of Christianity and your’s. Let us examine it again. Swedenborg is *so much* a Christian, as to make Christ all in all, seeing nothing but him and his kingdom in every passage of the scriptures ; but Dr. Priestley has *so little* of Christ in his doctrines, that he is scarcely to be found in them ; or if he be there, there is no room for him, but in the character of a *mere man*. Swedenborg acknowledges the divinity and sanctity of the Word, because in the supreme sense it treats solely of the Lord Jesus Christ : but Dr. Priestley admits of its sanctity upon no such principle ; for in the first place, (as might naturally be expected from his denying the divinity of the Lord’s person, and asserting that he was no more than a mere man, because he had the appearance of one,) he denies that the scriptures have any other meaning than that “ which is to be found in the customary sense of the words ;” and in the second place, he supposes, that Jesus Christ was typified and spoken of in no other light than as a mere man, like the rest of his brethren the prophets. That the scriptures, however, in *every part* treat of the Lord, agreeably to the assertion of Swedenborg, is plain from the following passages in the evangelist ; Jesus said unto his disciples, “ O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken ! And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them *in all the scriptures* the things *concerning himself*. And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were

written in the *law of Moses*, and in the *prophets*, and in the *Psalms, concerning me*," Luke xxiv. 25, 27, 44. In the Apocalypse also it is written, "*The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy*," Apoc. xix. 10. To object, therefore, against this part of the doctrines of the New Church, is in fact to object against the scriptures themselves, as well as against their divine Author, from whom they are derived, and of whom they constantly treat.

It is asserted by the New Church, not only that the Word treats of the Lord, but that the Lord himself is the Word: on which you remark, p. 58, "that it is a manifest absurdity to make a real person, whether God or man, to be the same thing with a *writing* concerning him." However strange this may appear at the first mention of it, like many other things equally difficult of comprehension, it will, when rightly understood, be found to be a great truth. It is said in John i. 1, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and *God was the Word*." Here the very thing which you object to, is plainly asserted of God. God is a *real person*, as you have acknowledged, p. 63; yet he is declared to be the same as the Word, which is a *writing* concerning him; and what is singular enough, even you yourself have subscribed to the same sentiment in p. 30, although in the present case, p. 58, you reject it as a manifest absurdity.

To obtain a clear comprehension of this subject, it will be necessary to attend to the following considerations. Every man is a man by virtue of his two constituent principles of life, which are the will and understanding. These two principles in union, or what amounts to the same thing, the good and the truth of which he is receptive, form the very substance of his spiritual body, and are what distinguish him from all others. So that it may with propriety be said, that every man is his own particular love, and his

own particular wisdom: and wherever these are manifested, whether in his works or words, in his life or writings, they are of the same essence with himself, and in this respect are really the man himself existing as it were out of himself; every thing that is predicable of the one, being (generally speaking) equally so of the other. It is upon this principle, and this alone, that the laws of justice in every nation take cognizance of a man's conduct in life, and punish or reward his *person* according to the quality of his *words* and *actions*; for there is in all justice, as such, an intuitive discernment, that whatever proceeds from a man is of the same essence with the man himself, and that his person; principles, and practice, are inseparably united. For the same reason also it is said in the scripture, that after death men will be judged according to their words and works. "I say unto you, that every idle *word* that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment," Matt. xii. 36. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth; their *works* do follow them," Apoc. xiv. 13. "They were judged every way according to their *works*," Apoc. xx. 13. Now if it be true of every man, that he is his own particular good and truth, the human form being the continent thereof, and that whatever proceeds from him is of the same essence with himself; how plain is it to see, that the Lord must, in a supereminent degree, be his own essential good and essential truth, or essential love and essential wisdom; and that when these are said to proceed from him, being of the same essence with himself, they are in this respect the same thing as himself. Agreeably hereto, the evangelist John declares, that the Word, which proceeded forth from God, is nevertheless still God. And when it is said, that the Word was made flesh, it is the same thing as if it had been declared, that God was made flesh. From all which the following conclusion may be fairly drawn,

That as the Word, when made flesh, still continued to be the Word; so flesh, after the Word became such, was and is the same with divine truth; consequently that God and his Word are inseparably one.

* * *

I observed, in a former part of this *Defence*, that the holy Scriptures are not written, in any part whatever, by mere tropes, figures, or metaphors, but everywhere by correspondences; the difference between which and bare figurative expression, I also promised to point out. This I shall now attempt to do in the best manner I am able.

Correspondence in general may be defined, the relation subsisting between the essence of a thing and its form, or between the cause and its effect: thus the whole natural world corresponds to the spiritual world; the body of a man, with all its parts, corresponds to his soul; and the literal sense of the Word corresponds to its spiritual sense. So that wherever there is a correspondence, there is necessarily implied such an *union* between two things, as only takes place when the one is derived from the other, in the same manner as an effect is derived from its efficient cause, or as speech is derived from thought, and the gestures of the body from the affections of the mind; in all which cases the exterior forms can no more be separated from the interior essence, than the body of a man can be separated from his soul without death. Such is the nature and power of *correspondences*. Let us now see whether the same can be said of mere *figure* and *metaphor*.

A mere figure or metaphor is the resemblance, in some certain way, which one thing bears to another, not according to the true nature and fitness of things, so much as by the arbitrary choice of a speaker or writer, who is desirous of illustrating his subject, and rendering it familiar to the comprehension. Consequently there is no necessary union

between the subject and the figure, nor is the one an effect of the other, or in anywise dependent on it for its existence and subsistence, as is the case in all correspondences. An example will illustrate the truth of my observation. Virgil, in his *Æneid*, lib. 2, likens the destruction of Troy, with her lofty spires, to the fall of an aged oak on being hewn down by the woodman's hatchet. This is a simile, or figure, but not a correspondence : for there is no necessary connection between the city of Troy and a mountain oak, nor between her lofty spires and the wide-extending branches of a tree. The one is not *within* the other, as its life and soul ; nor can the relationship subsisting between them be considered like that of cause and effect, essence and form, prior and posterior, soul and body, which nevertheless, as before observed, is the case with all true correspondences.

The difference between a mere figure and a correspondence may again appear from the following consideration. A mere figure or simile is the resemblance which one *natural* object or circumstance is supposed to bear to another *natural* object or circumstance ; whereas a correspondence is the actual relation subsisting between a *natural* object and a *spiritual* subject, or a *natural* form and a *spiritual* essence ; that is, between *outer* and *inner*, *lower* and *higher*, *nature* and *spirit* ; and not between *nature* and *nature*, or *spirit* and *spirit*. This distinction should be well attended to. The language of correspondences is the language of God himself, being that in which he always speaks, both in his Word, and in his works : but figure and metaphor, together with the language of fable, are the mere inventions of man, which took their rise when the divine science of correspondences began to be lost in the world.

This being a subject of considerable importance, I shall take the liberty of adding a few further remarks, which, though not immediately connected with it, may yet serve

to illustrate the doctrine of the New Church with respect to the language in which the literal sense of the Word is written.

Numbers, as well as names, in the holy Word, are significative and correspondent : therefore it is said, Apoc. xiii. 18, "Here is wisdom : let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast : for it is the number of a man ; and his number is six hundred threc-score and six." Many commentators have puzzled both themselves and their readers in attempting to unfold the signification of the number 666 ; but I believe they are all agreed in applying it to the Romish church exclusively. Herein, however, they are much mistaken ; for the whole chapter, in the spiritual sense, treats of the Reformed churches only. Indeed I must say, the more I reflect on the learned, the laboured, and the ingenious explanations given by the most celebrated writers on the subject, who have confined their ideas to natural, historical, and external things, the more I am convinced, that *not one of them all*, however eminent or distinguished his name, has had even a faint glimpse of its real and genuine meaning. I speak this without any derogation from the talents or acquirements of any writer ; for I wish to pay a proper respect to every man of learning, who has in any measure laboured for the improvement and information of the world. But it appears to me impossible, that the most acute natural understanding could ever, by virtue of its own powers, penetrate into the interior recesses of the holy Word, which can only be brought to light by means of a revelation from the same Spirit which dictated it. It further appears, that the book of revelation, called the Apocalypse, was in divine providence sealed from the eyes of all the world until the present day ; and that it is a series of prophecies particularly designed for the use of the New Church, the true meaning of which cannot be

understood without the science of correspondences; which science is revived in the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, and has its foundation in the Word of God, as well as in the works of creation.

I remember to have read, some years ago, many curious explanations of the number 666, all having reference to the titles of the pope, in Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, or in some other way alluding to the church of Rome. The words *Lateinos, Romiith, Vicarius Generalis Dei in terris, Vicarius Filii Dei*, with various others, were by dint of numeral powers, and such like calculations, all made to produce the exact compliment 666. At that time I thought some attention was due to those ingenious speculations; but on further inquiry I soon found, that not only the names above mentioned would make up the required number, but perhaps an hundred and fifty other names, that could no more be supposed to have any connection with the contents of the Apocalypse, than the *man in the moon*. I then saw, that *all such explications* could not be the effect of that wisdom spoken of in the 13th chapter, and to which we are invited; but that there must be some other hidden meaning, with which the learned were unacquainted. It did not satisfy me, that *Lateinos, Romiith, Vicarius Filii Dei*, or even *Ludovicus*, made up the compliment 666, when other words were to be found, that did the same, such as *Joseph Smith, Tomkins, Benjamin Bennet*, and what is singular enough, the *Rev. Jos. Priestley*; for by the magical power of numerals I can bring them all to sing the same song, *six hundred and sixty-six*. It was indeed a *curious* circumstance; but I thought *that* not sufficient for one who is in search of genuine truth; neither did I then, nor do I now think, that a mere *rebus* or *conundrum* is worthy a place in those oracles of divine truth, whose Author is no less than the great Jehovah, the God of heaven and earth.

The Apocalypse, like every other book of divine inspiration, is couched in *natural* terms, to represent and point out *spiritual* things ; and there is as great a distinction between the *type* and *antitype*, as between what is *natural* and what is *spiritual*. Now the *antitype* and *type* ought never to be understood as existing in one and the same *gradus*, but in two distinct, *discrete* states of being. Understand me right : I mean, that a prophecy couched in *natural* terms, ought not to be expected to have its fulfilment in a *natural* manner, but in a manner *discretely distinct* from it, that is, in a *spiritual* manner. Thus, when in Scripture it is said, that *seven* or *ten kings* shall arise ; that a *beast had seven heads and ten horns*, &c. &c. we are not to understand, that in the accomplishment of this prophecy there shall literally arise *seven* or *ten kings*, or that there shall be any *real beast with seven heads and ten horns*, for this would be confounding the *antitype* with the *type* in the same *gradus*, or same *state of existence* ; but we are to understand, that the prophecy will be accomplished when *what is signified by seven or ten kings*, and when *what is signified by seven heads and ten horns*, shall take place in the church : and this is placing the *antitype* in a *degree* or *state of existence* above the *type*. All the prophecies in the Apocalypse are of this sort ; and therefore it appears to me contrary to the true sense of Scripture, to suppose that a fulfilment of that prophecy in the 13th chapter can be discovered in any man's name that happens to make up the number 666 ; for this would be taking both the type and antitype in one and the same *gradus*, as before observed, when nevertheless I believe there is not a single prophecy either in the Old or New Testament, but what its accomplishment ought to be understood as principally belonging to the internal sense ; though I will admit, that many of them have also been literally fulfilled.

As the true meaning of the number 666 may be seen at large in Swedenborg's *Apocalypse Revealed*, I shall here only observe, that the whole chapter, in which it is contained, gives a description of the faith of the Protestant or Reformed churches, particularly in respect to its separation from charity or good works, and that the number of the beast denotes the quality of that faith, as being a complex of the most enormous falses. It is called the *number of a man*, because number signifies quality, and man signifies wisdom and intelligence, but in the opposite sense, as in the present case, self-derived wisdom ; for it is said of those who separate faith from charity. I have already observed, that a whole church, or community of men, appears before the Lord as *one man* : it is for this reason that the *quality of a church* is, in the letter of Scripture, said to be the *number of a man*. See a further explanation of this subject in the *Magazine of Knowledge, &c.* vol. i, p. 210.

I shall conclude my remarks on the holy Scriptures and the science of correspondences with the following quotation from the work entitled *True Christian Religion*, n. 200 to 207. “ It is asserted in the church, that the Word is holy, inasmuch as Jehovah the Lord spake it ; but because its holiness doth not appear in its literal sense, therefore they who once begin to doubt about its holiness on that account, in the future course of their reading confirm their doubts by many passages they meet with, suggesting these scrupulous questions, Can this be holy ? Can this be divine ? Now to prevent the influence of such doubts on men's minds, lest they should become general, and in consequence thereof the Word of God should be rejected as a common trivial writing, and thereby the Lord's conjunction with man should be cut off, it hath pleased the Lord, at this time, to reveal its spiritual sense, for the purpose of discovering to mankind in what part of it its divine sanctity

lieth concealed. But to illustrate this, let us apply to examples. In the Word we find frequent mention made sometimes of Egypt, sometimes of Ashur, sometimes of Edom, of Moab, of the children of Ammon, of the Philistines, of Tyre and Sidon, and of Gog: they now, who do not know that by those names the things of heaven and of the church are signified, may easily be led into an erroneous notion, that the Word treateth much of people and nations, and but little of heaven and the church, consequently much about earthly things, and but little about heavenly things: whereas, were such persons acquainted with what is signified by those people and nations, or by their names, this might be the means to lead them out of error into truth. In like manner, when it is observed, that in the Word frequent mention is made of gardens, groves, woods, and also of the trees that grow therein, as the olive, the vine, the cedar, the poplar, and the oak; and also of lambs, sheep, goats, calves, oxen; and likewise of mountains, hills, valleys, fountains, rivers, waters, and the like; he who knoweth nothing of the spiritual sense of the Word, must of necessity be led to suppose, that nothing further is meant by these things than what is expressed in the letter; for he little thinketh, that by a garden, a grove, and a wood, are meant wisdom, intelligence, science; that by the olive, the vine, the cedar, the poplar, and the oak, are meant the good and truth of the church, under the different characters of celestial, spiritual, rational, natural, and sensual; that by a lamb, a sheep, a goat, a calf, and an ox, are meant innocence, charity, and natural affection; that by mountains, hills, and valleys, are meant the higher, the lower, and the lowest things relating to the church; also, that by Egypt is signified what is scientific, by Ashur what is rational, by Edom what is natural, by Moab the adulteration of good, by the children of Ammon the adulteration

of truth, by the Philistines faith without charity, by Tyre and Sidon the knowledges of goodness and truth, by Gog external worship without internal ; in general, by Jacob in the Word is understood the church-natural, by Israel the church-spiritual, and by Judah the church-celestial. When the mind is opened to this knowledge, it may then be able to conceive that the Word treateth solely of celestial things, and that the earthly things mentioned in it are only the subjects wherein those celestials are contained. But let us take another instance from the Word, for the illustration of this truth. We read in Isaiah, “ In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt, and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land ; whom Jehovah of Hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance,” chap. xix. 23, 24, 25. By these words, in their spiritual sense, is signified, that at the time of the Lord’s coming, the scientific, the rational, and the spiritual should make one, and that then the scientific should serve the rational, and both the spiritual ; for, as was said above, by Egypt is signified the scientific, by Ashur or Assyria the rational, and by Israel the spiritual ; by the repetition of the words, *in that day*, is meant the first and second coming of the Lord.

“ What is meant by correspondence, hath to this day remained unknown, notwithstanding it was a subject most familiar to the men of the most ancient times, who esteemed it the science of sciences, and cultivated it so universally, that all their books and tracts were written by correspondences. The book of Job, which was a book of the ancient church, is full of correspondences. The hieroglyphics of

the Egyptians, and the fabulous stories of antiquity, were founded on the same science ; all the ancient churches were churches representative of spiritual things ; their ceremonies, and even their statutes, which were rules for the institution of their worship, consisted of mere correspondences ; in like manner, every thing in the Israelitish church, their burnt-offerings, sacrifices, meat-offerings, and drink-offerings, with all the particulars belonging to each, were correspondences ; so also was the tabernacle, with all the things contained in it ; and likewise their festivals, as the feast of the unleavened bread, the feast of tabernacles, the feast of the first-fruits ; also, the priesthood of Aaron and the Levites, and the garments of their holiness. Now, forasmuch as divine things fix their existence in outward nature in correspondences, therefore the Word was written by mere correspondences ; and for the same reason, the Lord, in consequence of speaking from the Divinity, spake by correspondences ; for whatever proceedeth from the Divinity, when it comes into outward nature, manifests itself in such outward things as correspond with what is divine, which outward things become then the repositories of divine things, otherwise called celestial and spiritual, that lie contained within them in a hidden and mysterious manner.

“ The science of correspondences was not only known, but also cultivated in many kingdoms of Asia, particularly in the land of Canaan, Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, Syria, Arabia, in Tyre, Sidon, and Nineveh, and from thence it was conveyed into Greece, where it was changed into fable, as may appear from the works of the most ancient writers in that country.

“ To shew that the science of correspondences was long preserved amongst the Asiatic nations, but chiefly amongst those who were called diviners and wise men, and by some

magi, I shall adduce a remarkable instance from 1 Sam. chap. v. and vi. We are there informed, that the Ark, containing the two tables, whereon were written the ten commandments, was taken by the Philistines, and placed in the house of Dagon, in Ashdod, and that Dagon fell to the ground before it, and afterwards, that his head and both the palms of his hands were separated from his body, and lay on the threshold, and that the people of Ashdod and Ekron, to the number of several thousands, were smitten with emerods, and that the land was devoured with mice; and that the Philistines, on this occasion, called together their priests and diviners, and that to put a stop to the destruction which threatened them, they came to this determination, viz. that they would make five golden emerods, and five golden mice, and a new cart, and would set the ark on this cart, and have it drawn by two milch-kine, which lowed in the way before the cart, and thus would send back the ark unto the children of Israel, by whom the kine and the cart were offered up in sacrifice, and the God of Israel was appeased. That all these devices of the Philistine diviners were correspondences, is evident from their signification, which is this; the Philistines themselves signified those who are influenced by faith separate from charity; Dagon represented their religious worship; the emerods, wherewith they were smitten, signified the natural loves, which, if separated from spiritual love, are unclean; and mice signified the devastation of the church, by falsifications of truth; a new cart signified natural doctrine of the church; for chariot, in the Word, signifieth doctrine derived from spiritual truths; the milch-kine signified good natural affections; the golden emerods signified the natural loves purified and made good; the golden mice signified the devastation of the church removed by means of goodness; for gold, in the Word, signifieth goodness; the lowing of the kine in the way signified

the difficult conversion of the concupiscences of evil in the natural man into good affections ; the offering up of the kine and the cart as a burnt-offering, signified that thus the God of Israel was rendered propitious. All these things then, which the Philistines did by the advice of their diviners, were correspondences ; from which it appears, that that science was long preserved amongst the gentiles.

“ Forasmuch as the representative rites of the church, which were correspondences, in process of time, began to be corrupted by idolatrous and likewise magical applications of them ; therefore, the science of correspondences was, by the Divine Providence of the Lord, successively darkened, and, amongst the Israelitish and Jewish people, entirely obliterated. Indeed, the divine worship of that people consisted of mere correspondences, and consequently was representative of heavenly things, but still they had no knowledge of a single thing represented ; for they were altogether natural men, and therefore had neither inclination nor ability to gain any understanding of spiritual and celestial subjects ; for the same reason they were necessarily ignorant of correspondences, these being representations of things spiritual and celestial in things natural.

“ The reason why the idolatries of the gentiles of old took their rise from the science of correspondences, was, because all things that appear on the face of the earth have correspondence, consequently, not only trees and vegetables but also beasts, birds, and fishes of every kind, and all other animals. The ancients, who were versed in the science of correspondences, made themselves images, which corresponded with things celestial ; and were greatly delighted therewith, by reason of their signification, and that they could discern in them what related to heaven and the church ; and therefore they placed those images both in their temples, and also in their houses, not with any inten-

tion to worship them, but to serve as a means of recollecting the celestial things signified by them. Hence, in Egypt and in other places they made images of calves, oxen, serpents, and also children, old men, and virgins; because calves and oxen signified the affections and power of the natural man; serpents, the prudence and likewise cunning of the sensual man; children, innocence and charity; old men, wisdom; and virgins, the affections of truth, &c. Succeeding ages, when the science of correspondences was obliterated, began to adore as holy, and at length to worship as deities, the images and pictures set up by their forefathers, because they found them in and about their temples. For the same reason, the ancients performed their worship in gardens and groves, according to the different kinds of trees growing therein; and also on mountains and hills; for gardens and groves signified wisdom and intelligence, and every particular tree something that had relation thereto, as the olive the good of love; the vine, truth derived from that good; the cedar, good and truth rational; a mountain, the highest heaven; a hill, the heaven beneath. That the science of correspondences remained amongst many eastern nations, even till the coming of the Lord, may appear also from the wise men of the east, who visited the Lord at his nativity; wherefore a star went before them, and they brought with them gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh, Matt. ii. 1, 2, 9, 10, 11; for the star which went before them signified knowledge from heaven; gold signified celestial good; frankincense, spiritual good; and myrrh, natural good, which are the three constituents of all worship. But still the science of correspondences was annihilated amongst the Israelitish and Jewish people, although all parts of their worship, and all the statutes and judgments given them by Moses, and all things contained in the Word, were correspondences; the reason was, because they were idolaters at heart, and con-

sequently of such a nature and genius, that they were not willing to allow that any part of their worship had a celestial and spiritual signification, for they believed that all the parts thereof were holy of themselves; wherefore had the celestial and spiritual significations been revealed to them, they would not only have rejected, but also have prophaned them; for this reason, heaven was so shut up against them, that they scarce knew whether there was such a thing as eternal life; and that such was the case with them, appears evident from the circumstance, that they did not acknowledge the Lord, although the whole Scripture throughout prophesied concerning him, and foretold his coming; they rejected him solely on that account, because he instructed them about an heavenly kingdom, and not about an earthly one; for they wanted a Messiah, who should exalt them above all nations in the world, and not a Messiah, who should provide only for their eternal salvation.

“ The reason why the science of correspondences, which is the true key to the spiritual sense of the Word, was not discovered to later ages, was, because the Christians of the primitive church were men of such great simplicity, that it was to no purpose to discover it to them; for had it been discovered, they would have found no use in it, nor would they have understood it. After those first ages of Christianity, there arose thick clouds of darkness, which overspread the whole Christian world, first in consequence of many heretical opinions propagated in the church, and soon after in consequence of the decrees and determinations of the COUNCIL OF NICE, concerning the existence of three divine persons from eternity, and concerning the person of Christ, as the Son of Mary, and not as the Son of Jehovah God; hence sprung the present faith of justification, in which three Gods are approached and worshipped, according

to their respective orders, and on which depend all and every thing belonging to the present church, as the members of the body depend upon the head ; and because men applied every part of the Word to confirm this erroneous faith, therefore the spiritual sense could not be discovered ; for had it been discovered, they would have applied it also to a confirmation of the same faith, and thereby would have prophaned the very holy Word, and thus would have shut up heaven entirely against themselves, and have removed the Lord from the church.

“ The reason why the science of correspondences, which is the key to the spiritual sense of the Word, is revealed at this day, is, because the divine truths of the church are now coming to light, and of these the spiritual sense of the Word consisteth ; and whilst these are in man, the literal sense of the Word cannot be perverted ; for the literal sense is capable of being turned any way, but if it be turned to favour the false, then its internal sanctity is destroyed, and the external along with it, whereas, if it be turned to favour the truth, then the sanctity is preserved. That the spiritual sense of the Word should be opened now, at this time, is signified by John seeing heaven open, and the white horse ; and also by his seeing and hearing the angel, who stood in the sun, calling all people together to a great supper, Apoc. xix. 11 to 18. But that it would not be acknowledged for some time, is signified by the beast and the kings of the earth, who were about to make war with him that sat on the white horse, Apoc. xix. 19 ; and also by the dragon, which persecuted the woman, that brought forth the man-child, into the wilderness, and cast out of his mouth water as a flood after her, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood, Apoc. xii. 13 to 17.”

* * *

V. *Of the Second Coming of the Lord.*

It is written in Matt. xxiv. 29, 30, 31, “Immediately after the tribulation of those days, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven : and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the sign of the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.” From this and similar passages in the Word, understood merely according to the literal sense, has arisen the generally prevailing notion, that the Lord will appear personally in the clouds of heaven, at which time all who have ever lived since the creation of the world, are to be raised up out of their graves, and their souls again clothed with their bodies ; and when thus assembled in one place, that they who have lived well, will be judged to eternal life or heaven, and those who have done evil, to eternal death or hell. Into this opinion, I observe, that you, Sir, in common with the rest of your neighbours, have fallen ; not knowing, that by the clouds of heaven, in which the Lord is to make his appearance, is meant the literal sense of the Word, and by glory its spiritual sense ; consequently, that the Lord, when the church is at an end, will reveal to mankind the spiritual sense of the Word, and thus manifest divine truth such as it is in its purity, which is the true sign of the last judgment taking place.

It is one of the charges you bring against the members of the New Jerusalem, that they do not believe on this subject in like manner with yourself ; and that they take the

bare assertions of Swedenborg in the room of rational proof. The first part of the charge is true enough ; but as to the latter, you are mistaken ; for although we set a very high value on his solemn declarations, yet we do not receive them *merely as such*, independent of proper evidence, but as satisfactory illustrations of the true Scripture doctrine of the Lord's second advent, the last judgment, and the resurrection.

With respect to the Lord's *second advent*, the doctrine of the New Church is this ; that the Lord cannot come *in person* into the material world, because since his ascension into heaven he is in his glorified humanity, and in this humanity, although it is omnipresent, he cannot be seen by any man unless his spiritual eyes be first opened, as was the case with all who saw him after his resurrection ; for as a material eye can see nothing but matter, so the Lord's glorified body being divinely substantial, and not material, can only be seen by a spiritual eye. Indeed it is a clear case to me, that were the Lord to make his *personal* appearance among men in the unclouded splendour of his Divine Humanity. it would be attended with more certain destruction to the whole race of mankind, than if this ball of earth, together with all its inhabitants, were cast into the sun. But although the Lord cannot, consistently with divine order, come personally into the world, yet he can in his Word, which being the divine truth proceeding from himself, is in this respect the same thing as himself. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and *God was the Word*," John i. 1.

To this you object, p. 39, "When the disciples were viewing Jesus ascending to heaven, the angels who stood by said to them, Acts i. 11, 'Ye men of Galilee, why look ye up to heaven? This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have

seen him go into heaven.' What (you ask) can be more evident from this, than that as the ascent of Jesus was personal and visible, his return will be the same, personal and visible, not figurative or emblematical only, meaning not himself, but his doctrines ?" In answer to this, I have to observe, that the whole passage from which you have drawn the objection, is the record of a transaction that occurred, *not in the natural, but in the spiritual world* ; for, as has been already proved, the Lord never was, nor could be, seen after his resurrection, by the material eyes of any man. He was then in the lower parts of the spiritual world ; consequently his personal ascent must have been from *thence* into heaven, and not from the material world, which he had left forty days before, viz. at the time of his resurrection. Besides, there are clouds in the spiritual world, equally as well as in the natural world ; and the clouds of the former are more properly called the *clouds of heaven*, than the latter, which in fact are nothing but the *clouds of the earth*. It is evident, therefore, that what the angels said of Jesus returning from heaven in like manner as he went up into heaven, ought to be understood as alluding to his appearance in the spiritual world, at the time of his second coming, and not to any personal appearance in the natural world. To men on earth who are enlightened so as to discern the spiritual sense of the Scriptures, the Lord appears as divine truth : but to those inhabitants of the spiritual world, who in heart acknowledge him as the only God of heaven and earth, he not only manifests himself in the character of divine truth, but also occasionally presents himself in person, descending in the same glorious manner, as the men of Galilee saw him ascend. And thus the event, which the angels foretold, hath actually taken place.

That the above passage in the Acts of the Apostles

cannot with propriety be understood in any other sense than that already explained, may further appear from this consideration, that the Lord's ascension was visible only to his followers, whose eyes were opened, and not to the bulk of mankind. Now if he is to come again *in like manner*, as is expressly declared, it follows, that his second advent will be witnessed and acknowledged, not by the bulk of mankind in general, but (as before, so now again) by his followers only, whose spiritual eyes or understandings are opened to discern his Word. And all such, in consequence of clearly comprehending the meaning of John, when he says, that God was the Word, will see that the Lord's advent in his Word, consisting of a revelation of its internal contents, is neither a mere figure nor an emblem, but a divine reality.

It was before observed, that by the clouds of heaven, in which the Lord is said to come, is meant the Word in its literal sense. This is proved from the following passages. "God rode upon a cherub, and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind. His pavilion round about him were dark waters, and *thick clouds* of the skies. At the brightness that was before him, his *thick clouds* passed," Psalm xviii. 10 to 12. "Ascribe ye strength unto God; his excellency is over Israel, and his strength is in the *clouds*," Psalm lxviii. 34. "And Jehovah will create upon every dwelling-place of mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a *cloud* and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for upon all the glory shall be a covering," Isaiah iv. 5. "Behold, Jehovah rideth upon a *swift cloud*," Isaiah xix. 1. "He bindeth up the waters in his *thick clouds*, and the *cloud* is not rent under them. He holdeth back the face of his throne, and spreadeth his *cloud* upon it," Job xxvi. 8, 9. In all these passages clouds denote the literal sense of the Word; and riding

upon a cloud signifies instruction in divine truth. The same was represented by the thick cloud in which Jehovah descended upon mount Sinai, when the law was delivered to Moses, that being the *first-fruits* of the Word. From all which circumstances it is evident, that the Lord's second coming in the clouds of heaven, which is for the purpose of bringing into his church the *full harvest* of the Word, can have no other meaning than his more immediate presence in the literal sense of the Word, in consequence of the revelation which is now taking place of its spiritual sense.

* * *

VI. *Of the Last Judgment.*

Emanuel Swedenborg asserts, that the last judgment was accomplished in the spiritual world, in the year 1757. On this you take occasion to raise three objections, the first of which is, p. 38, that "to all appearance no difference whatever then took place in the power of man to contend with vice or prejudice." The second occurs in p. 39, where you charge the members of the New Church with holding, "that no future judgment is to be looked for." And the third is, p. 42, that "according to Mr. Swedenborg the last judgment took place in the spiritual world only, and of course none could be judged besides those who had been dead:" whereas it is your opinion, that "those who shall be found alive at the coming of Christ, and who will not die at all, are to be judged, as well as those who have been dead;" consequently that the whole process of the last judgment is to be as literal and formal as any trial in a court of justice.

As to the first objection, that has been already answered in the preceding part of this *Defence*, p. 33 to 36, where it is shewn, that a most extraordinary change has manifestly taken place, since the year 1757, throughout every nation

in christendom, particularly in regard to the liberty of thinking about religious and civil concerns. The restoration of this spiritual liberty to mankind was announced by Emanuel Swedenborg in his *Treatise on the Last Judgment* so long ago as the year 1758; which was at a time when the general operation of that liberty could not be perceived in the natural world; for as yet the spiritual judgment had not descended as an efficient cause into natural effects: wherefore it required some length of time to manifest, in the outward actions of men, the change which had passed in their interiors, that is, in the spiritual world. But the event has since proved the truth of his assertion; and I doubt not but every year's experience will in future tend more and more to confirm it.

Exclusive of these reasons for believing that the judgment, spoken of in the Scriptures, is already accomplished, there are others of considerable weight, amounting to little less than a kind of demonstrative proof. When mention is made of the last judgment in the Word of God, it is generally represented as an event which is to be succeeded by an extraordinary degree of illumination, and knowledge of divine things, vouchsafed to the human mind, by means of a new revelation. Thus the coming of the Son of Man is compared to *lightning shining out of the east*, Matt. xxiv. 27. After the judgment of the great whore, John says, "I saw *heaven opened*, and behold a *white horse*: and he that sat upon him was called *The Word of God*," Apoc. xix. 11, 13; evidently alluding to the understanding of the spiritual sense of the Scriptures, which was to take place after the judgment. The same is further described in chap. xxi. by the new heaven and new earth, and the holy city New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven; which event, as it is now taking place, is a proof that the last judgment, according to the Scriptures, has been already performed,

the one coming to pass as the certain consequence of the other.

The truth of our doctrine concerning the actual accomplishment of the last judgment, is further confirmed by the following consideration. Our Lord says, “The time cometh, when I shall *no more speak unto you in proverbs*, but *I shall shew you plainly of the Father*,” John xvi. 25. The speaking no more in proverbs, can mean nothing else but revealing in plain terms the spiritual sense of his Word. This is effected in the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg; which is a corroborating proof, that the present day is the time to which our Lord alluded, as the æra of his second advent. But above all, the fulfilment of his promise, that in that day he would shew us plainly of the Father, is to me a most certain and indubitable proof, that the last judgment is actually accomplished; for prior to this, men were no more disposed to hear that Jesus himself was the Father, than they were in the days of his flesh; therefore he said, “I have yet many things to say unto you, but *ye cannot bear them now*,” John xvi. 12. Now no church, or set of men, that have heretofore existed since the first institution of christianity, have ever yet pretended to any *plainer knowledge of the Father*, than was enjoyed by the apostles, and immediate disciples of the Lord; and yet it was predicted, that a day would come, when such knowledge would be communicated to the church. The prophet Isaiah indeed long ago declared, that the *Child* which was to be born, the *Son* which was to be given, should be called *God*, the *Father of eternity*, Isaiah ix. 6. But who ever believed his report? Where is the church, that ever acknowledged Jesus Christ to be the *Father of eternity*, as well as the *Son* that was *born in time*? Where are the builders that ever made *Him* the *chief corner-stone* of their building? directing all their worship to *Him alone* as the *Head*

of the church, and not to another being whom they vainly imagined to be superior to him? Where are such churches, such christians to be found, as will bring *all* their praise, *all* their glory, and *all* their honour, and lay them down at *his* feet, in humble and prostrate adoration, acknowledging *Him alone* as the *Father* and *Saviour* of mankind? Excepting the members of the New Jerusalem, I know of none that have ever had such a *plain* and *direct knowledge* of the Father, not merely as dwelling in the person of Jesus Christ, as God may be said to dwell in a good man, but as being identically one and the same with him. This circumstance is therefore to me a demonstrative proof, not only that the last judgment is accomplished, and thereby an end put to the former Christian church, but also that the New Church and kingdom of Christ is begun, that he hath taken to himself his great power, and that henceforth he shall reign for ever and ever.

Your second objection, in which you charge the members of the New Church with holding, “that no future judgment is to be looked for,” is not a true representation of our belief in that respect: for although we really believe, that the last *general* judgment was accomplished in the year 1757, yet we also maintain, that every man *in particular* will be judged immediately after death, and that he will be rewarded according to the deeds done in the body, whether they have been good or evil. The last judgment we consider to be of various signification, general, particular, and singular; *general*, as having respect to the end of a church; *particular*, in reference to the death of individuals; and *singular*, with respect to the future state of man as determined by every thought and affection, every word and work.

The common idea of the last judgment being *universal*, and decisive of the fate of all mankind without exception, the deceased among whom are supposed to be reserved in

some unknown place till that great day, is not only hostile to the true sense of Scripture, but also repugnant to sound reason. By the Scriptures we are informed, that two general judgments have taken place on the inhabitants of this earth, prior to that in the year 1757. The first was the last judgment of the most ancient church, when all charity and faith perished, and which is described in Genesis by the flood. At that time, according to the language of the Word, heaven and earth passed away, that is, the internals and externals of the church perished, and a new heaven and a new earth were created, that is, a new church, which succeeded the former, and may be called the ancient church. The last judgment of this second general church, which included many particular churches, together with the representative of a church established among the posterity of Jacob, took place at the time of the Lord's first coming into the world. The prophet Isaiah speaks of this judgment, to be accomplished by the Lord, in the following terms: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. I have trodden the winepress alone: *I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury*; and *their blood* shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the *day of vengeance* is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come," Isaiah lxiii. 1, 3, 4. Hence it appears, that judgment and redemption commence at the same time; which is further evident from the following passages: "Zion shall be *redeemed with judgment*, and her converts with righteousness. And the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together," Isaiah i. 27, 28. "The Lord shall purge the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the *spirit of judgment*, and by the *spirit of burning*," Isaiah iv. 4. Not to mention many other

places to the same effect in this and other prophets. The Lord himself also, when he was in the act of fulfilling those prophecies, and executing the judgment, says, "*Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out,*" John xii. 31. In another place, "*Verily verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man,*" John v. 25, 26, 27. Again, "*Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world,*" John xvi. 33. From which passages it is evident, that a day of judgment is not spoken of in the Scriptures, as an event the like of which has never yet in any former period taken place, or as decisive of the fate of every individual of the human race; for we find, that the Lord, when on earth, actually accomplished a judgment not upon the whole race of mankind, but only upon those who were deceased, and consequently in the spiritual world.

These considerations sufficiently obviate your third objection, and prove, that the doctrine of the New Church respecting the last judgment is perfectly consistent with the Word of God; while all those systems, which suppose the destruction of the universe as the necessary consequence of that event, can be considered in no other light, than as so many idle dreams, and dreadful chimeras, calculated to frighten mankind, and to inspire them with no one useful or rational sentiment, but on the contrary with dismal expectation and useless alarm.

The end of creation is the formation of an angelic heaven out of the human race, which, as an image of the Creator, may bear some respect to his infinity and eternity. But this respect to infinity and eternity would cease, were

the habitable earth to be destroyed at the day of the last judgment ; for then, by a period being put to the procreations of mankind, the extent of heaven, together with the number of its inhabitants, would be limited : whereas, it is highly reasonable to suppose, that as the human mind, which is an heaven in its smallest form, increases in perfection according to the plurality of its knowledges, so the angelic heaven will likewise advance in perfection, and thus more and more resemble its Creator, according to the perpetually increasing number of its inhabitants. Hence the doctrines which attribute to the Divine Being an end worthy of himself in the creation of the world, by making provision for the perpetual generations and eternal successions of mankind, must be the most rational in themselves, as well as most conformable to divine revelation, when properly understood. That the habitable earth is not to be destroyed at the time of the last judgment, is plain from the Lord's words in Luke, " I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed ; the one shall be taken, and *the other shall be left*. Two women shall be grinding together ; the one shall be taken, and *the other left*. Two men shall be in the field ; the one shall be taken, and *the other left*," chap. xvii. 34, 35, 36. Here the last time of the church is called night, because there is no genuine faith remaining, in consequence of there being no true charity : but that the world would not then be destroyed, is plainly declared by the circumstance of some being left while others are removed. The same doctrine may be confirmed from the following passages : " Jehovah built his sanctuary like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established *for ever*," Psalm lxxviii. 69. " Thou hast established the earth, and it *abideth*," Psalm cxix. 90. " One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh : but *the earth abideth for ever*," Eccles. i. 4.

In addition to the above, I will here transcribe the following passage from the Treatise on the *Last Judgment*, n. 30, 32, shewing why men are judged in the spiritual world, and not in the natural. “ No one is judged from the natural man, consequently not whilst he is living in the natural world, inasmuch as man is then in a natural body : but all are judged in the spiritual man, consequently when they come into the spiritual world, for man is then in a spiritual body. It is the spiritual part of man that is judged, but not the natural ; for this latter is in no respect faulty or criminal, inasmuch as it does not live of itself, but is merely a servant or instrument, whereby the spiritual man acts. Hence also it is, that judgment passes on men, when they have put off their natural, and put on their spiritual body. In this body a man also appears according to his true quality with respect to love and faith ; for every one in the spiritual world is an image or likeness of his own love, not only with respect to his face and body, but with respect to his speech and actions. Hence it is, that all are known and distinguished as to their real quality, and immediately separated, when it is the good pleasure of the Lord. From what has been said it also appears evident, that the judgment takes place in the spiritual world, and not in the natural world or on the earths.

“ For every one after death is bound to, or in fellowship with, a certain society, and this immediately on his entering into the spiritual world. As soon as ever spirits are gathered together, and separated, they are also judged, and every one instantly fixed in his own place, the good in heaven, and in society there with their like, and the evil in hell, and in society there with their like. Hence it is manifest, that the last judgment can only take place in the spiritual world, as well because every one there is an image of his own life, as because all are associated together who

are in a similar life, consequently every one is in fellowship with his like. It is otherwise in the natural world, where the good and the bad are intermixed; there no one knows the real quality of another, nor are they separated from each other according to the affection of their life. Besides, it is impossible for any man with his natural body to be either in heaven or in hell; wherefore, in order that man may enter into one or the other, it is necessary that he put off his natural body, and afterwards be judged in his spiritual body. Hence it is, as observed above, that the spiritual man is judged, and not the natural.

* * *

VII. *Of the Resurrection.*

As the notions commonly entertained about the resurrection of the dead, are, like those on the last judgment and the second coming of the Lord, drawn from the mere letter of Scripture, without any knowledge of its spiritual sense, it is not to be expected, that they should approach any nearer the truth than the other. From the idea you entertain of heavenly happiness, that it cannot be perceived by the soul, except while united to a gross material body, you take it for granted, that all men, on their death, are reduced to a state of torpor, inactivity, or extinction, in which condition they are to remain till the last day, when you suppose the spark of life will be re-kindled, and again animate the same body which had been consigned to the grave, notwithstanding its having been devoured by worms, &c. In this opinion you likewise seem to be confirmed by the circumstance of the resurrection of Jesus Christ with his whole body, which like the first-fruits under the law, you consider as a sample of the general harvest at the resurrection of all mankind, in like manner with their whole bodies. Hence, p. 37, you remark as follows: “According to the

Scriptures, the resurrection of Christ is a pattern of our own resurrection, and therefore he is called *the first-fruits from the dead*. What were the first-fruits under the law, but a sample of the general harvest? Whatever, therefore, Christ now is, we shall be also, when with us, as with him, corruption shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality.”

If by the *first-fruits* from the dead you understand the *first body* that was raised from the dead, (which evidently appears to be the sense in which you take that expression,) your premises are false, and consequently the whole of your reasoning founded thereon must be inconclusive. According to the Scriptures, Jesus was not the first that was raised from the dead; for he himself raised Lazarus, John xi. 43, 44; likewise Jairus’s daughter, Mark v. 41, 42; and the widow’s son, Luke vii. 14, 15. The prophet Elisha also raised the Shunamite’s son, 2 Kings iv. 34, 35. And even after his death, when a dead man was let down into his sepulchre, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived, and stood up on his feet, 2 Kings xiii. 21. All these are instances of persons rising from the dead, previous to the resurrection of our Lord; which are sufficient to prove, that the expression of Christ’s being *the first-fruits from the dead*, is not to be understood according to the sense which you seem to put upon it, but rather as implying the same thing that is signified by his being called the *first-begotten of the dead*, Apoc. i. 5; the *first-born*, Psalm lxxxix. 27; and the *resurrection itself*, John xi. 25; that is, the primary and sole fountain, from whom all other beings derive their life.

I may here take occasion to observe, as a striking proof of the divinity of Jesus, that his body, after his resurrection, so essentially differed from those of Lazarus, Jairus’s daughter, and the Shunamite’s son, who were also raised

from the dead, that while these latter were again conversant with mankind, in like manner as they had been before their decease, that is, in gross material bodies, which were liable to a second natural death, the Humanity of the Lord was only occasionally visible to his disciples, and no more subject to sufferings or death. That the body of Lazarus after his being raised from the grave, was not exempt from the usual infirmities of human nature, is plain from the circumstance of the chief priests consulting how they might put him to death, John xii. 10. But of Jesus, after his resurrection, no such circumstance is related, nor could such a design by any possibility be put in execution. This therefore, furnishes an additional argument in favour of his divinity, and proves that Christ was more than a man.

You say, “Whatever Christ now is, we shall also be, when with us, as with him, corruption shall have put on incorruption,” &c. By these words you seem to insinuate, that Jesus was no more than a mere man, and that, as such, he saw corruption in common with the rest of the dead. But had you studied to invent a declaration more contrary to the true sense of the Scriptures than this, I am inclined to believe you would have found some difficulty in the attempt. David, who represented the Lord, says, “My flesh shall rest in hope : for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, *neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption,*” Psalm xvi. 9, 10. That these words were spoken of Jesus, is plain from this circumstance, that David in his own person saw corruption, whereas Jesus saw no corruption, for before corruption could take place he rose from the dead. With this agrees the testimony of Peter in Acts ii. 25, 30, 31, where he expressly says that David in that Psalm spake of Christ. The same is asserted by Paul in these words, “David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and *saw*

corruption : but he whom God raised again, *saw no corruption*," Acts xiii. 36, 37. Herein then is to be seen a striking distinction between Jesus and other men ; such a distinction as at once raises him above the whole of the human race, and characterizes him as their God, and not as a mere man, their fellow-creature. What he is, therefore, we can never be ; for he is Lord and Master, but we are only servants : he is the Head of the church, but we are scarcely members : he is Creator, Redeemer, Saviour ; but we are the created, redeemed, saved : he is the King ; we are the subjects : he is Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the All in all ; but we are—nothing. Such is the disparity between God and man, Jesus Christ and ourselves.

You seem, p. 40, to lay great stress on the account which Paul gives of the resurrection, in 1 Thess. iv. 15 to 17, where he says, "For this we say unto you by the Word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God ; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air : and so shall we ever be with the Lord." But all this may very easily be explained, consistently with the doctrines of the New Church, by considering it as spoken according to the appearances of the literal sense of the Word, which describes spiritual things by such images and expressions as are accommodated to the apprehension of men in the natural world. We have already seen that the Lord's second coming in the clouds of heaven is not to be understood as alluding to the atmospherical clouds over our heads, but to the literal sense of the Word, and to the appearance of clouds in the spiritual world. In this view the above passage per-

fectly coincides with our sentiments; for we maintain, that the new heaven is formed before the new earth, that is, the New Church takes place in the spiritual world before it does in the natural world; which agrees with this saying, that *the dead in Christ shall rise first*. And as the church on earth will be conjoined with the church in heaven, so as together to form only one church, like internal and external, therefore it is said, that we who are alive and remain, shall *be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air*; that is, we shall be enabled, at the Lord's second coming, when the spiritual sense of his Word shall be revealed, to penetrate through the shade and obscurity of the letter, and, discerning the glory of its inner contents, be elevated into the heat and light of heaven, by virtue of which we shall worship the Lord alone in spirit and in truth, as angels do above. In any other sense, what can be meant by being caught up in the clouds, and meeting the Lord in the air? Surely every rational and intelligent person must know, that heaven is no more in or above the clouds, than it is under them; and that the presence of the Lord is equally as well to be found upon the earth, as in any heights of the air or atmosphere!

Another passage which you quote as apparently favourable to your hypothesis, is that in 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, 53, where the apostle Paul says, "Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." In whatever sense these words of the apostle are to be interpreted, they ought at least to be taken in connection with the preceding verses of the same chapter. The construction which I observe you put upon them, is, that the

same material body which is committed to the earth, will rise again, and be made immortal. But this is not the doctrine of Paul; for he distinguishes between the natural corruptible body which is sown, and the spiritual incorruptible body which is raised. “Thou fool,” says he, “that which thou sowest, *thou sowest not that body that shall be,*” verse 37. “There are *celestial bodies,* and *bodies terrestrial,*” verse 40. There is a *natural body,* and there is a *spiritual body,*” verse 44, “Now this I say, brethren, that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption,*” verse 50. Hence, I think, we may fairly conclude, that Paul maintained the resurrection of man’s spiritual body, and not of his material, earthy, and corruptible body. In agreement with this, then, must the succeeding verses, which you have quoted, be understood. He begins, “Behold, I shew you a *mystery;*” plainly implying, that what he is going to add, is not to be understood literally, but spiritually; for were it to be taken according to the express tenor of the words, there would be no mystery in the case, but a simple prophetic narration. A mystery is something hidden from public view, being under the cover of appearances, which may either be misinterpreted or properly understood, according to the different degrees of illumination which different persons may possess. Paul, in most of his epistles, writes according to the literal sense of the Word; which indeed could not have been otherwise, inasmuch as the genuine spiritual sense was not at that time clearly revealed. Hence the appearance of Calvinism, and the doctrine of justification by faith alone, so visible in various parts of his writings, is by many confirmed as the genuine sentiment of Paul; when yet it is sufficiently clear from other parts, that he in reality maintained no such doctrines. See 1 Cor. xiii. 13: “Now abideth faith, hope, and charity: but the *greatest* of these is *charity.*” This also

is the express doctrine of the New Church. But writing as he did according to the appearances of truth in the letter of Scripture, it is no wonder that he should have been misunderstood by those who penetrated no further. Let us now see what is the real import of his words, agreeably to the true sense of Scripture. To be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, means nothing else but the certainty of passing from a natural into a spiritual state, at the time of the Lord's second coming; and this change may take place, according to its measure, as well with those who are now living, as with those who are already dead. Not that a material body shall be ever converted into a spiritual body, for this is a thing impossible, as being contrary to divine order; but on the death and removal of the former, together with all the imperfections of its nature, man will be endowed with a spiritual substantial body, in which he will live for ever, and no more see the corruption of death.

“Paul,” you say, p. 41, “compares the resurrection of the dead, 1 Cor. xv. 36, to the revival of seed that has been put into the ground; and we read, Rev. xx. 13, of the sea giving up its dead. But according to you, nothing that is ever committed to the ground, or to the sea, will appear again, or any thing else in the place of it.” With respect to the revival of seed that has been put into the ground, it is well known, that it is *not the same gross earthly substance* of the seed which grows up in the form of a new plant or tree, but only the spirit within it, which accumulates *fresh matter* from the juices of the soil in which it is sown. Hence Paul, in the very next verse to that which you mention, says, “And that which thou sowest, *thou sowest not that body which shall be*, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain.” This is a true emblem of man's resurrection; the material body,

which is laid in the grave, forms no part of that spiritual and substantial body, with which man rises; but the spirit, which is within the material body, quits it after death, and then man lives as a man in all respects as before, only in a more perfect state, in consequence of being disencumbered of the gross body of clay. You therefore do justice to the members of the New Church, when you report as their belief, that “nothing that is ever committed to the ground, or to the sea, will appear again :” but you by no means do justice to their sentiments, when you represent them as holding, that “nothing else is to appear in the place of it.”

As to the passage in Apoc. xx. 13, where it is said, that “the sea gave up the dead which were in it,” it has no respect whatever to the *sea* in the natural world, or to the dead bodies which have been there consigned. This indeed may appear even from the circumstance, that no notice is taken of the bodies which have been committed to the *earth*, although the number of these latter immensely exceeds that of the former, comprising in fact the general bulk of mankind. But it is still more plain from the words immediately following those above quoted, viz. “And *death and hell* delivered up the dead which were in them.” And again, verse 14, “*Death and hell* were cast into the *lake of fire*.” If we take these last words in their mere literal sense, we shall be under the necessity of supposing, that *hell shall be cast into hell*, which is a manifest absurdity. And if hell deliver up the dead, in order to present them before the judgment-seat, it will follow, that some men are consigned to hell, immediately on their death, not only before sentence of condemnation is passed upon them, but even before they are arraigned at the bar, and tried ; which is utterly inconsistent with every principle of justice, whether human or divine. This doctrine, moreover, is particu-

larly unfavourable to the scheme which you have adopted, respecting the state of souls after the death of the body ; for you suppose, that then the life of man becomes extinct, and that he neither goes to heaven nor to hell, until the arrival of a certain grand but awful day, usually called the end of the world, and day of judgment, when souls and bodies are to be re-united, and for the first time either raised to heaven, or thrust down into hell.

That man, however, rises again immediately after death, is evident from many passages in the Word, particularly the following : “ Jesus said to the thief on the cross, Verily I say unto thee, *To-day* shalt thou be with me in paradise,” Luke xxiii. 43. The same also appears from what the Lord said concerning Dives and Lazarus, that Dives went to hell, and thence conversed with Abraham ; and that Lazarus went to heaven ; and all this while men were still living in the world, consequently before what is generally understood by the day of judgment ; for when Dives intreated Abraham to send Lazarus from the dead to warn his brethren, Abraham answered, “ If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one *rose from the dead*,” Luke xvi. 31. It is further written, “ I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living*,” Matt. xxii. 32. Hence it appears, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, notwithstanding the death of their bodies, are still alive. The angel likewise said unto John who fell down to worship him, “ I am *thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets*,” Apoc. xix. 10. xxii. 9 : a demonstrative proof this, not only that man lives as a man after death, prior to the general judgment, but also that angels are of the human race, being no other than deceased men. So again, when Jesus was transfigured before Peter, James, and John, “ there appeared unto them

Moses and Elias talking with him," Matt, xvii. 3. And in the Acts of the Apostles, chap. x. 30, "Cornelius said, I prayed in my house, and behold, *a man* stood before me in bright clothing;" which same man is called *an angel* of God, verses 3, 7, 22.

When a proposition is clearly proved, it is unnecessary to urge further arguments on the same subject, I shall therefore conclude my remarks on the resurrection, by briefly shewing who are the persons meant by the living, and who by the dead, that are to be judged at the last day; for I observe you all along take the account of the judgment according to the first and lowest sense of the words, when yet, to be truly rational in our conceptions, we ought to elevate our minds to their highest sense, and thus from the letter ascend to the spirit. All who die in a state of regeneration, are in the language of Scripture called *living men*; but all who depart in an unregenerate state, are termed *dead*. Both descriptions of men will be judged; the former, as having the spirit of true life within them, to life eternal; but the latter, as being destitute of that life, to death eternal: life eternal is the life of angels in heaven; but death eternal is the life of devils in hell. The Lord alone knoweth the true state of every man; therefore the Lord alone is the judge of every man; and he will give to every one according to his works, whether they have been good or bad. This is what is meant by judging the living and the dead, good and evil being the only proper distinction between life and death, as invariably set forth in the Word of God.

* * *

VIII. *Of Marriages in Heaven.*

It is no wonder, that men, who have been accustomed to understand the Word of God in no other sense than that of the letter, should raise objections against that part of the

New Jerusalem doctrines, which asserts, that marriages take place in heaven, as well as upon earth. The plausibility of this objection appears the more striking from the reply made by our Lord, Luke xx. 34, to certain of the pharisees, who interrogated him about the resurrection; which, as might have been expected, is urged by you, Sir, as a decisive argument against the truth of our doctrine. But upon closer examination it will be found, that not only in the present, but in a variety of other instances, the Lord spake in a language adapted to the state of his hearers, who were so immersed in worldly and corporeal ideas, as to have no other conceptions of the heavenly state than such as were gross, earthly, and sensual. To have answered them in any other manner than he did, would have been to encourage them in their delusion: wherefore it was necessary, first of all, to withdraw them from the grossness of their imaginations, in order to prepare them for the reception of genuine truth. Marriage with them was no other than carnal conjunction, an union not of minds, but of bodies. With this view of marriage, they asked Jesus, which of the seven deceased brethren, who successively had lived with the same woman, should have her again to wife in the resurrection? To which he wisely answered, "The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage," (even according to your conceptions of marriage); "but they who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection of the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage," (in any such sense as you understand marriages,) Luke xx. 34, 35. Besides this interpretation of the words, they have a still further meaning, which may be explained as follows. Marriage, in the spiritual sense, signifies conjunction with the Lord; and this conjunction must be effected upon earth before death, or it never will in another life; for as the tree falls, so it lies. On this account it is

said, that in heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage ; that is, regeneration, which is begun, and entered into during the life of the body, is not *re-commenced* in heaven, like a *first act* of marriage, or spiritual conjunction with the Lord, but is carried on and perfected as the *sequel* or *confirmation* of a former covenant.

Many parts of the Scriptures are to be understood in a sense diametrically opposite to the expression of the letter ; as where it is said, that God is *angry*, that he *punishes*, *casts into hell*, and *destroys* ; that he has *arbitrarily chosen* a part of the human race for salvation, and *rejected* the rest ; instead of which the true sense is, that God is *loving* and *merciful to all*, hating *none*, punishing *none*, casting *none into hell*, destroying *none*, reprobating *none*. All these expressions are mere appearances accommodated to the infant apprehensions of man, who is apt to judge of the Lord by what passes in his own breast. In like manner when it is said, there are *no marriages* in heaven, the real truth is, that there *are marriages* there, not indeed such gross, carnal, and unchaste marriages as take place on earth, but marriages of a celestial kind, pure, chaste, holy, worthy of heaven, and where, in a supreme sense, the Lamb, the Lord God himself, is the husband of his church.

Again, it is said, that in heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, just as it said, that no man is to be called father, master, or rabbi ; that a rich man can scarcely be saved, it being easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a man who hath great riches to enter into the kingdom of heaven ; but that the poor, the lame, and the blind, gain easy admission : that we are to make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness : that the right eye is to be plucked out, and the right hand cut off, if they offend : that we are not to resist evil, but to him that smiteth us on the right cheek, to turn the other

also : that if any man will sue us at the law, and take away our coat, we are to let him have our cloak also : that in order to become a true disciple of Jesus, a man must hate his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also : that the Lord came into the world, not to send peace among men, but a sword ; and to set at variance with each other the father and the son, the mother and the daughter, &c. &c. In short, it is said, that in heaven they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, in the same sense as numerous other passages of Scripture speak of heavenly and divine things, the literal expressions of which are not in themselves naked or genuine truths, but truths clothed with appearances, and thus accommodated to the apprehensions of the simple, and of children.

That nevertheless there are marriages in heaven, as well as upon earth, consisting of the spiritual union between male and female minds, is clearly deducible not only from the original design of the creation of man, but also from the general sense of the Scriptures, which in many places represent heaven as a state of marriage. As there are two universal principles of life proceeding from the Creator, viz. good and truth, (although in him they are only one,) it is necessary that there be two universal receptacles in the intelligent creation to perceive and manifest that life. These two receptacles, in the general view of the human race, are male and female minds, separate indeed from each other while in their first and lowest state of being, but so formed that in their ascent towards their great original, they may be continually more and more united to each other : which union, as to the spirit, is so perfect and complete, that two minds, heretofore distinct from each other, at length constitute only one mind or one angel. Their bodies, it is true, still continue distinct from each other ;

for the union of *mind* can never be fully set forth by any union of *body*, although there is a perpetual effort to accomplish even this. Our Lord says, "Have ye not read, that he who made them at the beginning, made them *male and female*? And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and *they twain shall be one flesh*. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. *What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder,*" Matt. xix. 4, 5, 6. Hence it appears, that marriage, which consists in the union of male and female forms, both in the spiritual and in the natural world, is agreeable to the original unchangeable intent of the Creator, who being essential good and truth in most perfect union, desireth all the recipient forms thereof to become images and likenesses of himself.

Were it necessary, I might here take occasion to enlarge upon the subject, and shew how the two universal principles of life, above mentioned, manifest themselves in almost every part of the creation, both animate and inanimate. In the *animate*, we observe love and wisdom, good and truth, will and understanding, affection and thought, works and words; also in the construction of the body, a cerebellum and cerebrum, heart and lungs, pulse and respiration; two eyes, two ears, two arms, two legs, &c. &c. all of which, although distinguished into pairs, and thus expressive of man's twofold life, yet in point of use make only one act, one life, representative of that heavenly state of spiritual union between the sexes, which is again representative of the divine marriage of good and truth in the Lord, in whom since his glorification they are no longer two, but one. In the *inanimate* creation we may also trace similar representations, as in the heat and light proceeding from the sun, which are both united in one ray; the two polar virtues of magnetism; and the two powers of electri-

city, called positive and negative, which are united in one substance, as in a kind of marriage between male and female. The same thing may be seen in the distinction of plants according to what is called the sexual system, which bears so great a resemblance to the male and female sex in animals, that the most celebrated botanists have not scrupled to call them male and female plants. But in this they are mistaken, as may be seen in the note below.* However, there is a distinction in the parts of plants, analogous to the distinction of will and understanding in man, which under certain circumstances may be considered like male and female. Thus both the animate and inanimate creation, each in its peculiar way, points out and represents the union of good and truth, which is the same thing as celestial marriage.

That the Scriptures represent heaven as a state of marriage, is plain from those places where the Lord is spoken

* The Linnéan system supposes plants, &c. to be male and female, because of a certain distinction between their parts, called the *stamen* and *pistil*, the union of both which is necessary to render the seed prolific. But this distinction in plants is no more a sufficient reason for calling them male and female parts of a plant, than a similar distinction, which may be observed in all male animals, is for supposing there are male and female parts in one and the same animal. The characteristic peculiar to male animals is the formation of seed in themselves, which is first conceived in the understanding, then formed in the will, and afterwards translated to the lower parts of the body, where it is enveloped with a material covering, and thence conveyed into the womb, and last of all brought forth into open day. By tracing this analogy in the vegetable kingdom, we may easily see what is male, and what female. All plants are male, because they produce of themselves *seeds only*, and not new plants. The distinct parts of the plant, which some mistake for the male and female organs of generation, are nothing but analagous resemblances of the will and understanding, which are equally distinct in every male animal, and like them necessarily unite in the formation of seed. But this animal seed cannot produce new animals, until it is conveyed into the womb of a female, where, after undergoing a state of corruption, similar to that of death, it rises again in all the strength and vigour of a new and living animal. In like manner the seeds of plants, which are all male, cannot produce new plants, until they are sown in the womb of the earth, which is the common female, where they equally undergo a state of corruption similar to death, and after that rise up by vegetation into new plants. As therefore the *formation of seed* is peculiar to the male, and the *nourishment and expansion of it* peculiar to the female, it follows, that all the subjects of the vegetable kingdom are male, because they are concerned only in preparing seed for the production of plants; and that the earth alone is the common female, because it nourishes and expands the seed, and thus actually brings forth new plants.

of as a bridegroom or husband, and the church as his bride or wife; as from the following, “The *marriage* of the Lamb is come, and *his wife* hath made herself ready. Blessed are they who are called unto the *marriage-supper* of the Lamb,” Apoc. xix. 7, 9. “I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a *bride* adorned for her *husband*. Come hither, I will shew thee the *bride*, the Lamb’s *wife*,” Apoc. xxi. 2, 9. Again, “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king, who made a *marriage* for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the *wedding*,” Matt. xxii. 2, 3. “Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten *virgins*, who took their lamps, and went forth to meet the *bridegroom*, of whom five went in to the *marriage*,” Matt. xxv. 1 to 10.

If heaven itself is compared to a marriage, why should it seem an improbable thing, that marriages should take place there? particularly as man continues to live as a man after death, the male being still male, and the female still female? It is indeed supposed by many of the learned, that souls are of no sex; but this is a gross mistake; for the distinction of sex originates in the soul, and it is that which causes the body to have either the male or female form. The masculine principle consists in this, that love is inmost, whose clothing is wisdom; whereas the feminine principle has the wisdom of the male for its inmost, and the love thence derived (being a secondary love) for its clothing. Thus the female principle is derived from the male, agreeably to what is said in Gen. ii. 23, that the woman was taken out of the man. Now as in all love there is a tendency to conjunction, and as the male and female were so created that they two may become as it were one man, or one flesh, there being a conjunctive principle in every part of their constitution, it follows, that in every stage of existence this tendency to union must be

gratified, and consequently that there are marriages in heaven, where the end of creation is fully accomplished.

But you object, p. 43, “What is the end of marriage, but the propagation of the species? and since you allow this to have no place in the spiritual world, for what purpose is the difference of sexes, and what can you mean by conjugal delights in that state?” I have already shewn that marriage is the union of two principles, viz. good and truth, which originally were one, as in the Creator, but since the creation became separate. Immediately on their re-union *procreation* takes place, because it is the nearest possible resemblance of *creation*, for God being essential good and truth in perfect union, is in consequence thereof in the perpetual act of creating, that is, of preserving; preservation being no other than instant and perpetual creation. In heaven, although the union of minds is more complete, and the conjugal delights more blessed, than on earth, yet there is no propagation of the species, for want of an ultimate material basis wherein their spiritual principles may rest, and as it were see corruption prior to the formation of an actual and distinctly organized offspring. But instead thereof, there is a propagation of goods and truths, the essence of their species, which without doubt terminate in, and are adjoined to, their proper receptive forms in the natural world. Besides, the conjugal enjoyments of angels tend more and more to promote and confirm the union of male and female minds, and thereby to fulfil the divine law, that they twain shall be one flesh, Matt. xix. 5, 6. This therefore is the grand end of marriage.

It is said in Apoc. xii. 1, 2, 5, that “there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a *woman* clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet: and she being *with child*, cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered. And *she brought forth a man-child*, who was to rule all nations

with a rod of iron.” This being spoken prophetically, and consequently in the language of correspondence, by the man-child which was brought forth, we are not to understand literally a man-child, but that to which a man-child corresponds, viz. the *doctrine of the church*; and by the woman the New Church, which is the New Jerusalem. She was seen to bring forth a man-child in heaven, because the doctrines of the New Church originate there, and descend from thence into the natural world, where the child was actually born when the *Doctrine of the New Jerusalem*, the *Doctrine of the Lord*, the *Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture*, and the *Doctrine of Life*, were published, these being particularly signified by the man-child. In the Word frequent mention is made of generations and births, all of which have reference to good and truth; for nothing else is generated and born of the Lord as a husband, and of the church as a wife. The male offspring born in spiritual marriage, is truth and good in the understanding, and thence in thought; and the female offspring is truth and good in the will, and thence in affection.

Human souls descend from the Lord through all the heavens, but receive their interior quality, as well as their exterior forms, from their immediate progenitors: and such is the intimate connection subsisting between the angelic heaven and men upon earth, that I have no doubt but the marriages and conjugal enjoyments of angels are among the interior causes of human procreation, which may be justly considered as a natural effect flowing from the spiritual world. But as this is a subject of intricate research, and not absolutely necessary to be enlarged upon in this *Defence of the New Church*, I shall content myself with the observations already made, referring the reader for further information to Emanuel Swedenborg’s treatise, entitled, *The Delights of Wisdom respecting Conjugal Love*.

IX. *That Love and Wisdom are Substances, and not mere Properties.*

I am aware, Sir, that hitherto it has been a received opinion among metaphysicians, that love and wisdom are not real *substances* themselves, but mere *properties* of something else, which they call substance. Hence, I believe, has arisen that confusion and perplexity of idea so observable in the most celebrated writers, when treating of the being and attributes of God. While some represent him as an abstract being, destitute of all substance or form, which is the same as a mere nothing, others consider him as nature in its first principles, consequently as something material extending itself through, and filling the expanse of the universe. Such or similar must necessarily be the ideas of all those, who ground their reasonings upon the fallacious supposition, that love and wisdom are mere properties, and not real substances.

If Emanuel Swedenborg has introduced into the world an entire new system of metaphysics, as well as of theology, he is certainly entitled to a candid hearing; and no person ought to decide either upon his philosophy or divinity, until he has well examined what he has written on these subjects; for however true it may be, as you observe, p. 44, that "Swedenborg makes that to be substance, which all other writers call property," it does not hence follow, that his distinctions are less accurate, or his reasonings less true and conclusive. On the contrary, I believe, an impartial, unprejudiced mind may discern more true philosophy, and more solid argumentation in his metaphysical as well as theological disquisitions, than is to be met with in any writer that preceded, or that has hitherto succeeded him.

"God," says he, "inasmuch as he is an esse," that is, an original, infinite, self-subsisting being, "is also a substance; for an esse without a substance is a mere imaginary

entity; substance being a subsisting entity. And whatsoever is a substance, is likewise a form; for substance too without form is a mere imaginary entity. Wherefore both substance and form may be predicated of God, but with this distinction, that he is a substance and form sole-existent, self-existent, and primary." These are Swedenborg's own words in his work entitled *True Christian Religion*, n. 20; from which it appears you have not fairly represented his doctrine of the divine existence, in asserting (as you have done in p. 48, 49, 51, 54,) that he makes God to be *no substance* at all, but a *mere property*. What *he* calls a substance, namely, love and wisdom, *you* indeed call a property; but this ought to be no reason for commixing your distinctions with his, and then charging him with the absurdity which appears in the expressions, when all the while it is occasioned by your own inaccuracy in stating his sentiments.

Emanuel Swedenborg asserts, that God is love itself, wisdom itself, and life itself, on which you take occasion to observe as follows, p. 44: "That God is a being possessed of love, and wisdom, and life, is intelligible language; but that he is love, and wisdom, and life, is not so, except in a figurative sense." A fundamental error seems to be contained in these words, because they imply, that in God is something which is not God, just as in man there is something which is not man. But if love, wisdom, and life, are not in God as a self-subsisting, independent substance, then he must derive them from some other being, in whom they are such; which would be reducing him to the predicament of a creature, by whom, as a recipient, such things are indeed possessed, but in whom nevertheless they do not essentially reside as his proper own. God, however, is not a recipient either of love, wisdom, or life, but the primary source from whom they proceed: and therefore he is ex-

pressly called *love itself*, 1 John iv. 8; 16; *wisdom itself*, or *truth itself*, Luke xi. 49, John xiv. 6; and *life itself*, John xi. 25. Now as every thing that is in God, is God, he being infinitely and essentially *one*, it follows, that these three, love, wisdom, and life, are not only in God, as the essence of God, but also as his very substance and person.

That love and wisdom, with life which is their union, are real substance, is further evident from the following consideration. Whatever proceeds from any thing, must be a substance, and indeed of a nature similar to that from which it proceeds. A mere property, separate from a substance, cannot proceed; for in no respect does such an abstract property differ from a non-entity; and to say that nothing, or what is equivalent to nothing, proceeds from something, and is also received by something, what is this but language without sentiment, words without meaning? Now love and wisdom are acknowledged to proceed from God. But they cannot proceed from him as mere properties, for we have seen that on such a supposition they would amount to mere nothings. They must therefore proceed from him as a substance, which substance must be a form, and also of a nature similar to the fountain from whence it proceeds. Hence I conclude, 1. That God is the only self-subsisting, primary substance and form, from whom all other substances and forms are originally and perpetually derived. 2. That the divine love and wisdom in God, and proceeding from God, are also a real substance and form, giving life and being to all created substances and forms both in the spiritual and in the natural world.

Perhaps you may ask, ‘If love and wisdom be a *substance*, then what are its *properties*?’ To which I answer, The three following are the essential properties of divine love, viz. 1. To love others *out of itself*. 2. To desire to be *one with them*. And, 3. To desire to make others happy *from itself*.

These are the properties, which inhere to, and are inseparable from, the divine love of God. The property of divine wisdom is, to foresee and promote the accomplishment of those ends by the *best possible means*. These being the *properties* of divine love and wisdom, it is plain, that divine love and wisdom themselves must be a *substance*; for all property has relation to substance, which is a subject, and the divine love and divine wisdom in form are the subject of all divine properties.

You acknowledge, p. 49, that you are incapable of forming any ideas at all of the distinction between the divine *esse*, the divine *essence*, and the divine *existence*; and yet Swedenborg, and his translator, whose note you have quoted, make it very clear and intelligible to others. But it is rather singular, that a person, who professes his ignorance of the very *terms* made use of in the new system of metaphysics published by our Swedish author, should yet take upon him to decide against it. Can it be expected, that the public will look upon him as a competent judge, who has openly avowed his incapacity, by declaring in one place, that he *cannot form any ideas at all* about the matter; and in another place, that he finds himself included in the number of those who *do not understand* the writings of Swedenborg? It reminds me of a certain clerical gentleman, a doctor of divinity, who, after writing pretty freely against the doctrines of the New Church, candidly confessed to me, that he did not understand what Swedenborg meant by the three terms *celestial*, *spiritual*, and *natural*.

I shall conclude this article with the following quotation from Swedenborg's work, entitled, *Angelic Wisdom concerning Divine Love and Divine Wisdom*, n. 40 to 43, and 286; wherein he proves, that love and wisdom are both a substance and a form, and that this can be no other than the human form.

“ The common idea of men concerning love and wisdom is as of something volatile and floating in subtil air or ether; or as of an exhalation from something of such a nature; and scarcely any one thinks that they are really and actually a substance and a form. They who see that they are a substance and a form, nevertheless perceive love and wisdom out of their subjects as issuing from it; and what they perceive out of their subject as issuing from it, although it be perceived as something volatile and floating, they also call a substance and form, not knowing that love and wisdom are the subject itself, and that that which is perceived without it as something volatile and floating, is only an appearance of the state of the subject within itself. The causes why this hath not heretofore been seen are several; one is, that appearances are the first things from which the human mind forms its understanding, and that it cannot shake them off but by an investigation of the cause, and if the cause lies very deep, it cannot investigate it, without keeping the understanding some time in spiritual light, in which it cannot keep it long by reason of the natural light which continually draws it down. Nevertheless the truth is, that love and wisdom are a real and actual substance and form, which constitutes the subject itself.

“ But inasmuch as this is contrary to appearance, it may seem not to merit belief, unless it be demonstrated; and it cannot be demonstrated, except by such things as a man can perceive by his bodily senses; wherefore by them it shall be demonstrated. Man hath five senses, which are called feeling, taste, smell, hearing, and sight. The subject of feeling is the skin with which a man is encompassed, the substance and form itself of the skin cause it to feel what is applied; the sense of feeling is not in the things which are applied, but it is in the substance and form of the skin, which is the subject; the sense is only an affection thereof

from things applied. It is the same with the taste ; this sense is only an affection of the substance and form of the tongue ; the tongue is the subject. It is the same with the smell ; that odours affect the nose, and are in the nose, and that there is an affection thereof from odoriferous substances touching it, is well known, It is the same with hearing ; it appears as if the hearing was in the place where the sound begins, but the hearing is in the ear, and is an affection of its substance and form ; that the hearing is at a distance from the ear, is an appearance. It is the same with the sight ; it appears, when a man sees objects at a distance, as if the sight was there, but nevertheless it is in the eye which is the subject, and is in like manner an affection thereof : the distance is only from the judgment concluding concerning space from intermediate objects, or from the diminution and consequent obscuration of the object, whose image is produced within the eye according to the angle of incidence. Hence it appears, that the sight does not go from the eye to the object, but that the image of the object enters the eye, and affects its substance and form : for it is the same with the sight as it is with the hearing, the hearing does not go out of the ear to catch the sound, but the sound enters the ear and affects it. Hence it may appear, that the affection of a substance and form, which constitutes the sense, is not a thing separate from the subject, but only causeth a change in it, the subject remaining the subject then as before, and after. Hence it follows, that the sight, hearing, smell, taste, and feeling, are not any thing volatile flowing from those organs, but that they are the organs themselves considered in their substance and form, and that whilst they are affected the sense is produced.

“ It is the same with love and wisdom, with this only difference, that the substances and forms, which are love and wisdom, do not exist before the eyes as the organs of

the external senses; but still no one can deny, that those things of love and wisdom, which are called thoughts, perceptions, and affections, are substances and forms, and that they are not volatile entities flowing from nothing, or abstracted from that real and actual substance and form, which is the subject: for there are in the brain innumerable substances and forms, in which every interior sense, which hath relation to the understanding and the will, resides. That all the affections, perceptions, and thoughts there, are not exhalations from them, but that they are actually and really the subjects, which do not emit any thing from themselves, but only undergo changes according to the influences which affect them, may evidently appear from what hath been said above concerning the senses.

“Hence it may be seen that the divine love and the divine wisdom in themselves are a substance and form, for they are essence and existence itself; and if they were not such an essence and existence as they are a substance and form, they would only be an imaginary entity, which in itself is not any thing.”

Such is the reasoning of Emanuel Swedenborg in favour of the existence of love and wisdom, not as mere properties of something else, but as being themselves an actual substance and form. That this form is truly and properly human, he proves in n. 286 of the same work, in the following manner. “No intelligent person can deny, that in God there is love and wisdom, that there is mercy and clemency, that there is good and truth itself, because they are from him; and as he cannot deny that these things are in God, neither can he deny that God is a Man; for no one of them can exist abstractedly from man, for man is their subject, and to separate them from their subject, is to say that they do not exist. Think of wisdom, and place it without man, and then let me ask, Is it any thing? Can you conceive of

it as of some etherial principle, or as of some principle of fire? You cannot, unless possibly as existing in those principles, and if in them, it must then be wisdom in a form, such as man hath; yea, it must be in every form of man's, not one must be wanting, in order that wisdom may be in it. In a word, the form of wisdom is man; and forasmuch as man is the form of wisdom, he is also the form of love, mercy, clemency, good, and truth, because these act as one with wisdom."

* * *

X. *Of the Divine Influx.*

It is a leading doctrine of the New Church, that man is not life in himself, but merely a recipient of life, which continually flows from the fountain of all life, viz. God, who alone is life in himself; consequently that all love and wisdom, all good and truth, come from the same source. Agreeably hereto we also maintain, in the words of Swedenborg, that the spiritual world did exist, and does subsist, proximately from its own spiritual sun, and the natural world in like manner from its own natural or material sun. But to the first of these positions, you object, p. 45, that it is unphilosophical, because all our primary ideas are received from external objects through the medium of the bodily senses; and because Dr. Hartley has endeavoured to prove, that what Mr. Locke calls ideas of reflection, are nothing more than combinations of simple ideas, originally derived from impressions made by sensible objects. That this mode of reasoning is most agreeable to *appearances*, I readily grant: but it does not thence follow, that it is most *true* or *genuine*. The very circumstance of its being an *appearance* accommodated to the *bodily senses*, is with me sufficient to excite a suspicion of its fallacy; for I have ever found, that the appearances of nature, as first appre-

hended by the senses, are for the most part, if not altogether, *diametrically opposite to the truth of things.*

There are two kinds of order, the one of which is real, the other apparent ; or in other words, there is one order of the spiritual world, which has respect to the essence of things, and another order of the natural world, which has respect to the appearance of things as existing in time and space. This may be elucidated by the following comparison. In the building of a temple or house, the first thing in the natural world, and consequently the first thing in time, is the foundation, and the last a place to worship in, or to dwell in. But in the spiritual world, or what amounts to the same thing, *in the mind of the architect*, the order is entirely reversed, for the first and uppermost thing with him, which is the end in view, is a place to perform worship in, or to dwell in, and the last is the foundation. It is the same with the disposition of a garden, or the culture of land ; the first thing, in point of time and bodily labour, is to level the ground, and to prepare the soil for the reception of trees and seeds to be planted and sown. But the first thing, in respect to the mind, or end in view, is a plentiful harvest, and the enjoyment of the fruits to be produced. Hence I infer, that as in the above-mentioned instances the first things in point of time, are in reality the last in true order, being produced by those which are first in end, although last as to time ; so all our primary ideas, occasioned by impression from external objects, are in like manner produced from spiritual causes, which, though manifested last as to appearance, are yet first as to reality. Thus the order of divine influx, so beautifully explained and illustrated by Swedenborg, is proved to be both rational and philosophical ; while the contrary system of supposing love, wisdom, and life, to be

derived from senseless matter, can boast nothing but the merit of *fallacious appearance*.

In conformity with the above-mentioned appearances, and because man is so formed, that his intellectual or perceptive faculty first opens upon effects, and thence, by a retrograde motion as it were, ascends to causes, the holy Scriptures themselves, being accommodated to man's primary conceptions of truth, speak a similar language in their external sense; while internally they contain a meaning widely different, and treat of things, not as they appear in their outward forms, but as they are in their real essences. Thus in Gen. i. 14, it appears from the literal sense as if the sun was created on the fourth day, after the earth; when yet we know, or at least ought to know, that the sun, as being the fountain of natural heat and light, and thus as it were the father and supporter of its universe, must have been the primary work of creation in this natural world, and in the hands of divine omnipotence the instrument by which every material substance was originally produced.

It is an established rule in philosophy, that *subsistence* is a continuation of *existence*; and that whatever is the present cause of the one, must have been the original cause of the other. Whence it follows, that the earth, inasmuch as it is dependent on the sun for subsistence, by means of its heat and light, must have derived its existence also from the same fountain. That the earth is really dependent on the sun for subsistence, is sufficiently plain from its general appearance in time of winter, when not only the whole of the vegetable kingdom suffers a visible decay bordering on destruction, but many subjects likewise of the animal kingdom sink into a state of torpor and death-like sleep. If such effects are occasioned only by a *small withdrawing* of the sun's heat, what would not be the case, were the communication to be *totally cut off*! Could any thing short

of utter destruction, if not annihilation, be the certain consequence? Yet, notwithstanding these considerations, you most unaccountably assert, p. 45, that “the natural world, or the earth, does not, in any proper sense, exist or subsist from the material sun;” but that “they are two *independent bodies!*” that is to say, bodies which have no necessary connection with each other. From what system of philosophy you derive these sentiments, I know not. They are certainly foreign to that which is now generally adopted; and being equally foreign even to the appearances of truth, I believe you will find it difficult to support them by any natural experiments. In most, if not all your other doctrines, you have something plausible to appeal to, like the evidence of the senses; but in the present case I think it must be confessed, that even *appearances are against you*.

The doctrine of divine influx, as descending from God through heaven, first into the soul of man, and then into his body, is by Swedenborg amply and satisfactorily explained. Indeed one great end of his writings is to set this point in its true light, and thereby to convince mankind, that, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary, yet there is only one source of love, wisdom, and life, for all in the universe; but that they are received differently by each, according to the difference of their respective forms. As there is no necessity for enlarging on the subject in this place, I shall conclude it with the following remark.

It appears as if man derived all his ideas from external objects, as from a *cause*; but the truth is, he derives no idea whatever from them, as from a *cause*; which is plain from this consideration, that every cause is, in point of dignity, superior to its effect; whereas external objects are inferior in dignity to the ideas which are improperly called their effect. But it is equally true, that without external objects we can have no ideas at all; whence it follows, that

although external objects are not properly the *cause* of ideas, yet they are the necessary *occasion* of them, serving as mediating objects not only to embody ideas, but also to supply the mind with an *inert* power, which is as necessary to the rational faculty in its contemplation and sensible perception of spiritual truth, as mercury is to a looking-glass in the reflection of the rays of natural light. For as in the latter case, without an *opaque* substance *behind* the *glass*, to arrest and as it were embody the light, no *natural image* can be produced; so in the former case, without an *inert* principle *under* the *mind*, viz. in the bodily senses, in like manner to arrest and embody truth in its descent from heaven, no *spiritual idea* could be formed or sensibly perceived by man. To suppose, that wisdom, intelligence, or science, actually flow from dead material objects, because our ideas *appear* to be excited thereby, is no less absurd than to imagine, that the bright image seen in a mirror is actually derived from the dark opaque substance of the mercury, because the rays of light also *appear* to spring forth from it. The image really consists of natural light reflected from the mirror, according to the form of the object; and so also ideas, thoughts, and perceptions, actually consist of spiritual light, which is truth, in like manner reflected from external objects, according to the form of the human mind.

* * *

XI. *Of the Discovery of the Georgium Sidus.*

You object to the inspiration of Emanuel Swedenborg, that, though he visited not only the moon, and the other planets of our system, but also various planets belonging to other suns, he says nothing of that which has lately been discovered by Dr. Herschel. In answer to which, I have to observe, that although it is true he takes no notice of a

seventh primary planet in our system, in his *Treatise on the Earths in the Universe, and their Inhabitants*, yet in another book entitled, *De Cultu et Amore Dei*, n. 11, where he treats of the origin of the different planets, he expressly speaks of seven primary ones in the following terms. “*Seven** *fœtuses* were excluded from the sun at one birth, namely, as many in number as there are huge bodies revolving in the grand circle of the world; every one of which being poised in its sphere, in a ratio according to its bulk and weight, revolved quicker or slower, receding from its native centre. The kindred globes thus separated, made excursions into the open space, each with the velocity proper to its contents, and at the same time by spiral evolutions, extending by degrees, made large excursions into the ethereal regions. Some drew with them from their fostering parent smaller globes, more or less in number, which accompanied them as humble attendants, being admitted to revolve within their orbits. Our earth had only one as an attendant handmaid, called the moon, which receiving the luminous image of the sun on her surface, like a mirror, might reflect it on the face of the earth, her mistress, more especially in the night time. Thus wherever they were carried, and which way soever they were turned, they were notwithstanding under the intuition and direction of their common parent.”

* The author's own words are as follow : Septem erant fœtus uno nixu editi, quot scilicet corpora in maximo mundi circo errantia : horum unumquodvis in suâ sphærâ libratum, secundum rationem molis cum pondere, ocius aut segnius, a natali centro recessit. Ita separati fratres, quisque velocitate acceptâ patenti spatio insurgebat, & simul ac in gyros, etiam per gradus a gyris in peripherias per ætherem explanatas, excursum faciebat. Quidam etiam orbiculos, plures vel pauciores, tanquam famulos & satellites, intra gyratas circum se sphæras receptos, secum a parentis aulâ abduxerunt : nostra vero tellus non nisi quam unam, tanquam vernam, quæ Luna dicitur, ut illa luminosam Solis ethiæm in se ut in speculo exceptam, noctis cumprimis tempore, in telluris objectæ, suæ heræ, faciem, reflecteret : ita quocunque abirent, & utcunque se verterent, sub intuitu, & in præsentia sui parentis, nihilominus agebant.

In what manner Swedenborg obtained his information, I do not pretend to say ; but from the above passage (as I have elsewhere* observed in a note on the same,) it is plain, that he was apprized of the actual existence of *seven* primary planets in our solar system, though all the other philosophers of his day were acquainted with no more than *six*, viz. Mercury, Venus, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. The moon is not a primary planet, but a secondary one, and is by the author expressly considered as such ; so that it is impossible he could have meant to include the moon among the number of the seven ; for he says, that *some of the seven* had satellites revolving round them in small orbits, and then instances the moon as a *secondary* planet appointed to attend this earth. Swedenborg's treatise on the origin of the earth was published in Latin in the year 1745 ; and it was not till the year 1781 that Dr. Herschel discovered the seventh primary planet, called *Georgium Sidus*.

Whatever therefore may have been Swedenborg's reasons for not giving a particular account of the *Georgium Sidus*, or its inhabitants, in his treatise on the *Earths in the Universe*, it is plain, that the omission was not because he was unacquainted with a seventh primary planet in our system. But even supposing he had known nothing about it, such a circumstance would not at all affect the credit of his testimony in other matters ; for I never understood, that it is absolutely essential, to form the character of an inspired man, that he be acquainted with *every thing* that is to be known : it is sufficient, I apprehend, if in all his assertions about what he does know, he deliver himself in a rational, consistent manner, and prove his doctrines by the written Word of God.

* *Magazine of Knowledge*, &c. vol. 1, p. 426.

XII. *Of Time and Space in the Spiritual World.*

Swedenborg truly observes, that it is one of the most difficult things in the world for men, while living in the body, to withdraw their thoughts from time and space, and think of spiritual things with spiritual ideas, that is, with ideas that have no relation to time or space, but to *state*. Nay, so difficult does it appear to you, Sir, that in p. 49, you expressly declare, that you can easier admit the non-existence of God himself, than the non-existence of space or duration. Your words are, “ Though *we can*, in imagination, *suppose* the Divine Being himself not to have existed, yet it is *impossible* for us to exclude the ideas of space or duration.” From this I infer, that you conceive time and space, which in themselves are unsubstantial, inanimate, and destitute of intelligence, to be more necessary and independent in their existence, than he whom we call God ; consequently, that they ought rather to be considered as the First Cause of all things, than any intelligent Being, whose existence may in idea be dispensed with. Shocking as this may appear, I do not know that it is charging your principles with too much ; for in one place you give us to understand, that God is in the shape of infinite space, and in another you assert, that the most essential and necessary of all beings is space and duration ; which is no less than a virtual acknowledgment, that space itself, or duration itself, is God : for that which is *most essential and necessary*, must be *primary*, and that which is *primary* must be the *cause* of all beings, and such a cause is God. So true is the observation of Swedenborg, that they who exclude from their minds all ideas of the Divine Human Form of God, must unavoidably fall into naturalism or atheism.

You acknowledge, p. 61, that God is the maker and constant preserver of *all things*. Now space and duration are

either *something* or *nothing*. If they are *something*, then by your own confession they must have been *created*, and are still *preserved* by God. But if they are *nothing*, I leave you to extricate yourself, as well as you are able, out of the dilemma into which you have fallen, by asserting that the existence of God is less necessary, than the actual being of that which after all has no real existence! This latter is an absurdity, which I think you will not attempt to defend: and therefore you must stand to the first proposition, viz. that time and space were both introduced by God into the world at the creation; in which case you must also of necessity acknowledge, that God himself is above time and space, and consequently that in his own proper existence he bears no relation to either of them. But the truth of this shall be made more evident still.

Because God is omnipresent, you think he must necessarily bear some relation to space, by which you mean, that he must be extended through all space. But this idea of God is both irrational and unphilosophical; for if he be a subject of *extension*, he must be a subject of *division* also; in which case the idea of his *indivisible unity* would perish, and being himself, like any finite substance, *made up of parts*, he could never be considered as a God of infinite perfections. The absurdities necessarily attendant upon the supposition of God being extended through all space, according to the rules and laws of space, are so many and great, that I apprehend no intelligent person needs to have them recounted. I will, however, just mention one as a specimen of the rest. Were God to be infinitely extended, or in other words, to fill what is called infinite space, then on every division of the whole sphere into two hemispheres, by the horizon, it might be said, that the *one half* of God is in the one hemisphere, and the *other half* in the other: consequently he would not be *completely* and *wholly* pre-

sent in either of them distinctly. Thus by supposing a presence of divisible locality, the truest and noblest idea of the divine omnipresence is lost, which consists in being *fully, wholly, completely, and indivisibly* present in all spaces without space, and in all times without time. Any other kind of omnipresence is unworthy of God, and deserves not to be called divine.

But if the notion you entertain about the omnipresence of the Divine Being, as having relation to *space*, is found to be irrational, low, and unjust; no less monstrous and absurd must be that idea, which supposes an omnipresence bearing relation to *time*. By bringing down the Infinite into space, and confining his being to the properties thereof, as if his person and habitation were necessarily subject to the laws of natural extension, like those of his finite creatures on earth, it is easy to see what is the form you give him in your own mind. But when you assert that he must have relation to time, as being present in all duration as well as in all space, it is indeed hard to conceive what you can make of such omnipresence. According to the principles you lay down, viz. that the existence of God must have relation to time, it will follow, that as neither the *past* nor the *future* has at the present moment any actual existence, so neither has the omnipresence of God any actual relation to them; consequently that God is not omnipresent in respect to *all times*, but only in respect to that *one time*, which is now present. You cannot surely say, that the *past* time has any *present* existence; still less can you say, that the *future* has. If then they have no existence at the present moment, how can it be said, that the omnipresence of God, which is *something*, can have relation to that which is *nothing*? According to your own reasoning, it can only have relation to the fleeting *now*; for there is no other point of duration, on which you can lay your hand, and say,

It exists. Thus by limiting the Divine Being to the revolutions of time, you in the same breath deny his *eternity*, which is totally independent of all times, it not being even made up of them, and make his existence in no respect to differ from that of a temporary creature, with whom the past and the future are never present, except by recollection or anticipation.

From what has been said, it is plain to be seen, that no true idea of the divine omnipresence can be formed, unless we banish from the mind both time and space. The whole immensity of space must dwindle into a point, and all successions of time into a single moment, before we can rationally and satisfactorily perceive the omnipresence of God in a human form, or in any tolerable measure comprehend the mode of his eternal existence ; for with him all space is but a *point*, and all eternity a *present now*. Nay, even with man, who is but a finite being, there is a certain power inherent in his affections, capable of so contracting space, and shortening time, that they shall be to him as nothing. I can as readily think of the most distant star, as of the nearest object : it takes no more time to travel, in my thoughts, to the one, than to the other. Hence it appears, that whatever a person intensely thinks of, is as it were present with him, whether its distance in the natural world be great or small. So also in respect to time ; in all pleasing and joyous states of mind, the time seems short ; but in contrary states long : evincing, that neither time nor space bears any strict relation to will and understanding, affection and thought, in man ; and if so, still less can they be predicated of God, whose infinite perfections admit of no admeasurement.

That neither angels nor spirits have any thing to do with space, may easily be gathered from this circumstance, that even the human mind, which is an embodied spirit, is

not a proper subject of it. When we say, such a person has a *great* soul, we do not mean that his soul occupies a *great space*, for this kind of extension is only applicable to body ; but we mean, that he is possessed of certain qualities, which are as far superior to others, in point of real dignity or excellence, as some material objects exceed others in magnitude or bulk. The soul of a fat, corpulent man, although it may fill a body which occupies much more space than that of another who is less, yet is not on that account a whit the greater. Neither in cases of amputation of limbs, when the body evidently suffers in its dimensions, is the soul on that account a whit the less, although the space it occupies is considerably diminished : which is a plain proof, that *extension* in relation to space is not predicable of the soul, but *impletion* only. How absurd would it be to suppose, that with every alteration in the bulk of the body, occasioned by disorders or otherwise, a similar change takes place in the dimensions of the soul ! And yet this must be the case, if spirits and angels bear any such relation to space as bodies do : and with equal propriety you may talk of measuring the will and understanding by the carpenter's rule or bucket.

But in p. 48, you object, that “according to Swedenborg angels are *real beings*, in the form of men, and have all of them been men, who when they die throw off the material body, and appear in what he calls their substantial or celestial body. They must, therefore, as it should seem, occupy a portion of real space, as they did before, and consequently cannot reside except in real place. But what space, or place, is there in the affections, which are only properties of the mind ? What room is there for a good angel in the affection of love, or for a bad one in that of anger ?” Rather say, ‘What room is there for a *bad* angel in the affection of love, or for a *good* one in that of anger ?’

We have already seen, that affections are not mere pro-

perties, but that they are real spiritual substances. Therefore all your objections against the existence of space in the affections, as in mere properties of the mind, fall to the ground, having no application to the doctrines we maintain. Swedenborg asserts, that angels and spirits dwell in the affections of men, and yet they are not without place. But this is to be understood in the following manner. They are connected with space in no other way than through the medium of man, who is actually in it. They reside in man's affections, these affections reside in his body, and this body is actually in space. Thus angels and spirits may be said to reside in space, or place, not *immediately* or *directly* but *mediately* or *indirectly*. And *vice versa*, man himself, even while living in the body, is in like manner *indirectly* resident either in heaven or in hell; and after death, *actually* or *immediately* in the one or the other. Angels, therefore, do not actually occupy space in their own proper persons, although there is the same appearance of space with them in the spiritual world, as there is with men in the natural world; but they occupy human affections, which affections occupy human bodies, and these bodies are in actual space. Such is the connection between the inhabitants of the spiritual and those of the natural world, neither of whom can subsist independently of the other.

In answer to your question, p. 48, whether there must not be some beings as necessary to the affections of angels, as angels are to those of men, it is to be observed, that angels differ from each other, according to the heavens they inhabit, as much as spirits differ from men. The angels of the third or highest heaven are invisible to those of the second or middle heaven; these again are invisible to the angels of the first or lowest heaven; and these latter in their turn are invisible to common spirits, whose temporary residence is in the middle world between heaven and

hell. In each of these cases the superior dwells in the affections of the inferior, as spirits dwell in the affections of men; and it is in this way, that the links of creation are joined together. But there cannot be continued gradations of created beings quite up to the Creator himself, since between the highest finite creature and the infinite Creator, there always must be an infinite distance; and these gradations may as well terminate, where they actually do, viz. with the angels of the highest heaven, as any where else. Yet even in this case, the divine principle is accommodated to angelic affections by various descending gradations within itself, prior to its actual reception by the highest angels; for the sphere of divinity above the third heaven is so ardent and intense, that no creature could subsist a moment in it. Whence it follows, that although there are no superior beings resident in the affections of the highest angels, as they are in those of men, yet what is tantamount to the same, there is an *accommodated influx* of life within them, by virtue of which the Divine Being himself resides in them, as in his temple, and by their means in the good affections of mankind who are his footstool. And this is a sufficient answer to your next question, viz. “What was there to reside in the affections of the first men, who on their deaths only became the first angels?”

* . * . *

“The spiritual world of Swedenborg,” you say, p. 54, “bears some resemblance to the ideal world of Plato. Both, however, are equally the work of imagination; and it is remarkable, that, as in dreams, Swedenborg had no real new ideas communicated to him in the different worlds that he visited, but only such combinations of old ideas as commonly occur in dreams. Wherever he went, he found beings in the form of men, and the same animals that we have here, hills and vallies, seas and rivers, as with us.”

Whatever may be your opinion of the wisdom of Plato, and others of the ancients, I consider it far superior to that which passes for wisdom among many of our modern philosophers, whose conceptions of spirit are either so gross as to make it one and the same thing with matter, or so attenuated as to resolve it into mere vapour or nothing. As to your objection, that Swedenborg had no real new ideas communicated to him, because he describes the things of the spiritual world by similar objects in the natural, this will apply equally as well to the Scriptures themselves, as to his writings. Whenever the prophets speak of spiritual things, or of the appearances in another life, they always do it in such terms as are proper to natural language, and under such forms as we have been accustomed to behold. Nay, even when God himself delivers a new revelation, he does it by expressions, which, if analysed, are found to be no other than what you call combinations of old ideas. If therefore the circumstance of Swedenborg's describing the things of the spiritual world by natural forms, be a sufficient reason for rejecting his testimony, it is no less a reason for rejecting the Scriptures also, these being written exactly in the same manner. And if your doctrine of influx be true, in supposing that all intelligence and wisdom, or, to use your own words, all ideas, are derived from impressions made by sensible objects, and afterwards combined together, then revelation itself is but a particular arrangement of matter, and he, whom we suppose to be the fountain of wisdom, and call God, turns out to be no other than nature at last.

* * *

The next thing I have to remark upon, is a passage in p. 56, where you say, "There is certainly no small confusion in the ideas of Swedenborg, when he makes the *heavens* in the spiritual world synonymous to *angels*, and the *hells* to *devils*; as if these *real beings* and the *place* which they occupy were the same thing."

However confused this way of speaking may appear to you, Sir, it is certainly very common with the best speakers, as well as the best writers, on almost every subject. What, for example, is more common, than for a politician to talk of wars, treaties, and commerce, with *France, Spain, Russia, America, &c.* ? thus with the *places* as synonymous to the *people* that inhabit them ? And how frequently do we read of the *house* of lords, the *house* of commons, the *house* of Brunswick, the *house* of Bourbon, &c. &c. when at the same time nothing else is meant but the *persons* or *family* within or belonging to the house ? Nay, even you yourself, Sir, in the *Letters* you have addressed to the members of the New Church, make use of the *very same kind of language*, which you ridicule and condemn in Swedenborg. I will produce your own words. Speaking of a young lady's ingenious imitation of plants in paper, and comparing to the loss of them the destruction of your library and laboratory, you exclaim, in p. x. of your preface, "How would the *country* in general have been filled with *indignation*, had any envious female neighbour come by force, or stealth, and thrown all her flowers into the fire, and thus destroyed all the fruits of her ingenuity, and patient working for years, in a single moment !" Now here, Sir, you speak of a *country*, which is a *place*, being filled with *indignation*, which is an *affection of the human mind* ; and thus *persons* and *places* are made to be synonymous, by yourself, as well as by Swedenborg whom you oppose.

If we turn to the Scriptures, we shall find a similar language used in them. In Apoc. xxi. 22, the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are called the *temple* of the New Jerusalem. In 1 Sam. iv. 7, the *ark* of God and *God himself* are spoken of as synonymous. In Jonah ii. 2, the *whale's belly* is called the *belly of hell* ; thus the place *hell* and a *fish* are considered as synonymous terms. In Isaiah xxviii. 15, it is said, "We have made a covenant with *death*, and with *hell* we are at agreement." And in

Apoc. xx. 14, *death* and *hell* are said to be cast into the *lake of fire* : in both of which passages, *states* and *places* are mentioned instead of *persons*. So again, in Isaiah xxiii. 1, 4, the *ships* of Tarshish are addressed as *men*, and the *sea* itself is personified, and represented as saying in human language, “ I travail not, nor bring forth children, neither do I nourish up young men, nor bring up virgins.” Many other passages might be produced from the Word, wherein places and things evidently denote persons and states. But as I expect by this time you must see the impropriety of making that an objection to Swedenborg’s language, which equally militates against the Word of God, against the best speakers and writers on every subject, and even against yourself too, Sir, I shall leave you to reflect on the merits of the case, while I prepare to address you with a few concluding remarks.

* * *

XIII. *Of Charity ; and how it is to be understood, that neither Arians nor Socinians can be admitted into Heaven, when yet Men of every religious denomination may be saved, if they live uprightly and conscientiously according to the best of their knowledge.*

You charge Swedenborg, and those who have embraced his writings, with want of charity, because he asserts, and they believe, that no one can be admitted into heaven, who acknowledges a trinity of Gods, or who denies the divinity of Jesus Christ. Had this been a mere arbitrary assertion, without having its foundation in the Word of God, and in the true nature and fitness of things, there might have been some justness in your charge. But when it is considered, that one grand design of the Scriptures is, not only to teach the unity of God, but to point out *who and what he is*, in order that men may worship him in a manner the most likely to be effective of conjunction with him ; and when the same Scriptures inform us, that it is one of the

essential conditions of salvation, to acknowledge and believe the divinity of Jesus Christ, there is reason to suppose, that, notwithstanding the *apparent uncharitableness* of such a condition, it must in reality be otherwise, because dictated by him who is the fountain of *love* and *mercy*. It therefore becomes a business of the most serious concern to be properly acquainted with this interesting subject; seeing that on such acknowledgment, both in doctrine and in life, depends no less than our eternal welfare, or what amounts to the same thing, our admission into heaven.

It is not my intention to adduce all the passages of Scripture, that inculcate the necessity of believing in Jesus, as well as the Father, in order to ensure our future happiness. Let the following suffice. “He that *believeth on the Son*, hath everlasting life: and he that *believeth not the Son*, shall not see life,” John iii. 36. Jesus said, “If ye *believe not, that I Am*, ye shall die in your sins,” John viii. 24. “Ye believe in God, *believe also in me*. I am the way, and the *truth*, and the *life*,” John xiv. 1, 6. “This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, *and Jesus Christ* whom thou hast sent,” John xvii. 3. Upon such passages as these is founded Swedenborg’s assertion, that none can be admitted into heaven, but they who have faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, or one with the Father, and thus acknowledge the divinity of his humanity. Arians and Socinians falling short in this respect, are therefore condemned, not by the testimony of Swedenborg alone, but by the holy Scriptures themselves. “He that *rejecteth me*, (saith the Lord,) and *receiveth not my words*, hath one that judgeth him: *the word* that I have spoken, *the same* shall judge him in the last day,” John xii. 48. Again, “Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come,” Matt. xii. 32. To speak against the Holy Spirit, is to say that what proceeds from

Jesus is not holy in itself, to deny the divinity of his humanity, and to assert that he is a *mere man*, or a *mere angel*; thus that “he hath an *unclean spirit*,” Mark iii. 30; for in his sight, who *alone is holy*, Apoc. xv. 4, both angels and men are *filthy* and *unclean*, Job xv. 15, 16; Psalm xiv. 3. Therefore to ascribe to Jesus any thing short of personal and proper divinity, as Arians and Socinians do, and to be *confirmed* therein both in *doctrine* and in *life*, is coming within the description of those who *exclude themselves* from heaven, and who are therefore said to be guilty of a sin unto death, 1 John v. 16, or in other words, of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which cannot be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come.

In addition to the evidence arising from Scripture, we may also gather from the true nature and fitness of things, that no Arian or Socinian, *while he continues to be such*, can be admitted into heaven. If it be allowed, that heaven derives all its essence from the Lord’s humanity, which must be the case if the inhabitants are members of his body, then it will follow, that no person can have a place therein, but he who acknowledges Christ as his head; comparatively as no member of the human body can continue to be such, without receiving life from the head, and thus as it were acknowledging the source from which it derives its support.

No subject can gain admission to the court of an earthly prince, while he refuses to acknowledge his right and title to the crown; such a person by the very nature and fitness of things, being self-excluded. It is just the same with respect to admission into heaven, which is the court of the King of kings: all who enter the gates of that palace, must bear true allegiance to their lawful sovereign Jesus Christ; they must be loyal subjects; they must love him with their hearts; they must confess him with their tongues; and none else can taste angelic happiness, or even breathe celestial air.

That men of every religious persuasion, by whatever

name they are called, whether Arians, Socinians, Jews, Mahometans, or idolaters, may nevertheless be saved, as well as those who profess the truest religion in the world, provided they live a life of charity according to the best light they possess, and are not confirmed in the falses of their religion, is a doctrine to which I believe every member of the New Jerusalem most cheerfully subscribes. And further, that they who know and profess the most genuine, heavenly, and divine truths, if they live not in agreement with them, can have no place in heaven, where all is charity and mutual love; for the state of man after death depends not so much on the quality of his thoughts, opinions, and doctrines, as upon the quality of his affections and life. If these be good, no error of judgment will eventually exclude him from heaven: he may indeed be thereby retarded in his progress thither; but when by repeated instructions in the world of spirits his understanding is enlightened with the pure beams of angelic wisdom, he will then be prepared to enter into the full enjoyment of celestial happiness, and join the company of those blessed spirits, who unite in ascribing all blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

Having now, Sir, in the best manner my leisure hours would permit, made answer to every objection, which you have brought forward against the doctrines of the New Jerusalem; and having at the same time proved, as its fundamental article, the supreme and exclusive divinity of Jesus Christ, it only remains to be observed, that the whole is submitted to your serious reflection and consideration. If what has been advanced in the present *Defence of the New Church*, be neither consistent with Scripture nor reason, it will and ought to fall to the ground, as a work of imagination, and a delusion of the mind. But if, on the other hand, it should appear to be supported by the authority of both, then you, Sir, in common with every other seeker of truth

for the sake of truth, must feel yourself interested, in no small degree, in the decision of questions, which from their very nature, involve consequences of the utmost importance. The difference between believing aright and believing amiss, is something like the difference between doing good and doing evil, though not altogether so ; for it is possible, that he, whose opinions are false, may yet be faultless, and consequently in a salvable state ; whereas the man, whose life and conduct is evil, can expect nothing else but to incur the penalties of his guilt. Truth, genuine, unadulterated truth, is, I hope, with each of us the object of pursuit. But while we have in view the discovery of so great a treasure, let us not forget to prepare our minds for the lasting enjoyment of it, by cultivating with all diligence that heavenly principle of love and charity, which is not only the end, but also the producing cause of truth. Thus, whether we are now in the possession of it, or not, we shall most assuredly obtain it hereafter, when in heaven we are admitted to the fellowship of angels, and there commence actual citizens of the New Jerusalem.

In this hope, and with my most cordial wishes for your eternal prosperity,

I remain, SIR,

Your obedient Servant,

ROBERT HINDMARSH.

London, Jan. 1792.

FINIS.

A standard linear barcode consisting of vertical black bars of varying widths on a white background. Above the barcode, the text "GPO Library" is printed. Below the barcode, there are several lines of small, illegible text, likely a library identification number or date stamp.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD	PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.

